

THE  
**SOCIALIST  
STANDARD**

**1919**



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 173 Vol. 15.]

LONDON JANUARY, 1919

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## THE CAPITALIST NEW WORLD.

The "War that will end War" is over, and on the strength of this an immense explosive trust, called Explosives Trades Ltd., has been formed with an authorised capital of £18,000,000 (vide "Daily Chronicle," 2.12.18). If all wars are to end the combination of the 29 firms forming this company for the production of explosives is somewhat perplexing. If munitions of war are still to be manufactured on a large scale although there are to be no more wars, then the only conclusion one can come to is that they are to be produced for the keeping of the peace—that eternal "order" the capitalist cries for when working men attempt to interfere with his profit-making career.

On a superficial examination we are driven to the conclusion that those who raised the cry that this war would end war were liars—that in reality it was only the commencement of war on the grand scale.

When we come to look below the surface, however, we see that there is just a possibility that the war crowd were not quite such liars as we thought them. Perhaps, after all, it is the end of wars as understood by the capitalist mind—a struggle among the robbers for the largest share of the spoil. Perhaps they think that the end of this war will enable them to settle their local differences and thus be left free to pursue their policy of exploitation to the uttermost parts of the earth, with only one barrier—the growing class-consciousness and revolutionary tendency of the world's working class.

**Bullets** This being so their old enemy the  
**Still** workers, now growing to formidable  
**Needed.** proportions, neither so docile nor so pliable as of yore, having eaten to the full of capitalist bullets and capitalist gratitude, must be suppressed and kept within a certain prescribed relation to their masters. Hence the wheels of the munitions of war machine, the

instrument of suppression, must continue to whiz merrily round, and "pile up the war material" continue to be one of the watchwords and orders of the day.

Proof that there is at least a grain of truth in the above forecast is shown at every turn.  
**Hands** Sir Charles Macara, writing in  
**Off** the "Daily Chronicle" (18.12.18) bears  
**Profits.** witness to the intended great trade revival, and also reflects the deadly fear of his class that their profits may fall through a too rapid fall in prices. While workers are finding it difficult to obtain necessities in the shape of food and clothing this cotton magnate writes:

These raw materials, which contribute so largely to the production of clothing for the inhabitants of the globe, have been raised owing to the vicissitudes of war to almost unprecedented prices, and I hope the Allies will act together in controlling these commodities and distributing them equitably.

Further, it is in the interest of all just as important to prevent a too rapid depreciation in the price of these raw materials as it is to prevent a further undue inflation.

Workingmen have lost homes, limbs, and lives as a result of the war, but for God's sake don't let the capitalist lose a penny piece of profit!

Poor Sir Charles groans at the fact that wages were increased instead of bonuses being given, as the latter are more easily knocked off. He hopes:

The nations of the world would only fully realise their interdependence and organise capital and labour, work together in developing the undeveloped resources of the world.

Sir Charles need have no fear: the devil looks after his own. The process of organising capital and labour has already begun. The war has splendidly shown the capitalists how maximum of output can be obtained with the minimum of labour.

Contests have been held among workers for turning out work at the greatest possible speed.



Women have been introduced into numerous employments previously banned. "Unskilled" labour has been diffused among "skilled" in a way hitherto untried. Undertakings of all sorts are being fused, bringing further economies in the cost of production. Small firms have been wiped out by the thousand.

An Industrial Fatigue Research Board has been set up to determine the most economical ways of applying labour.

The Board's investigations will be directed towards finding the most favourable hours of labour, spells of work, and rest pauses, and they hope to receive help from both employers and workers in their enquiries.

"Daily Express," 20.12.18.

The nation that secures the most efficient production will be dominant in the new world on whose threshold we stand. That nation will be the one whose workers are the most contented, the best nourished, and the most physically fit. Keen, eager work—with the real heart and the real joy in it—judiciously blended with healthy exercise and sane recreation, gives the secret, the "open sesame," to success. Our final word to the professional fatigue victim—there will be a terribly long rest in the next world.—"Daily Express," 20.12.18.

Appointed by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Medical Research Committee jointly, it will consider hours and conditions of labour and methods, and how they cause fatigue, having regard to industrial efficiency and the health of the workers.

The Board will investigate, organise and promote by research, grants or otherwise, investigations in different industries, to find the most favourable hours of labour, spells of work, rest pauses, and other conditions applicable to the various processes, according to the nature of the work and its demands on the worker.

"Daily Chronicle," 20.12.18.

The meaning of all this is to transplant the military system into the industrial world still more completely, to develop as efficient an industrial army as our masters can so that the greatest possible amount of wealth can be produced and the smallest possible part of it returned to the workers in the shape of wages.

Our kind and loving masters, having laid their plans for a production of wealth (and profit) previously unheard of, standing as they do on the threshold of a new world of untold treasure, find one bar to the realisation of their ideal. This bar is the growing discontent and revolutionary tendency of the workers everywhere. They therefore must strengthen their military power and hold secure their political supremacy.

The situation in Russia fills them with anguish, and they are sending soldiers from all quarters to quell the revolution as quickly as possible. Classing themselves as the "Saviours of Society" and the champions of democracy, they pour vituperation upon the Bolsheviks and invite all comers to assist in saving Russia from destruction. The destruction they fear, however, is the destruction of the debts owed by Russia to European and other capitalists and the spreading of the revolution to other countries with the consequent break-up of

the capitalist regime. They therefore fall over each other in their anxiety to smash up and discredit the Bolsheviks.

What the workers may expect in the future is illustrated by the following which is reported from Amsterdam:

Serious rioting has occurred in Bottrop as a result of the Westphalian miners' strikes. A large crowd of demonstrators proceeded to the Gladbeck pits with a view, it is supposed, of wrecking the works, but the military intervened and fired machine guns among the strikers, killing some and injuring others.—"Daily Express," 20.12.18. (Italics mine.)

Now more than ever the need to get behind the guns should be obvious to all workers. The masters still control the military machine, and so long as this is so they can, in the last analysis, defeat all attempts of the workers to alter the basis of society. Working men and women must therefore organise politically to obtain control of the political machinery from which all power emanates. They will then be able to render the capitalists' dream of a new world but the stuff that dreams are made of.

GHEMAC.

## Mr. ROCK SAYS WE ERR.

We have received the following letter from Mr. J. Rock anent a statement which appeared in our November issue:

19 Grange Rd., N.W. 1.  
Nov. 17, 1918.

Sirs,—I beg to acquaint you of an inaccurate statement in the November issue of your paper, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, under the heading "By Request." You state in dealing with the London Aircraft Strike that that dispute failed to save Rock, the shop steward.

On the contrary, as a result of the further negotiations following the enquiry when the dismissal of Rock was confirmed resulted in Rock being reinstated. I was reinstated on Monday 12th, started on the same bench, and still am chairman of the Shop Committee. I have continued working at Waring's and Gillows to date.

Therefore the findings of the Committee of Enquiry set up in the first place by the Ministry of Munitions were quashed as a result of the M. of M. agreeing to the terms of the final settlement.—yours fraternally,

J. B. ROCK.

Mr. Rock's "correction" reads rather curiously. We said: "The London Air-craft Strike failed to save Rock, the shop-steward." This statement our correspondent denies by referring to the "result of further negotiations," but forgets to mention who carried on these "negotiations" and where their findings may be found.

To make the matter quite clear we place the following facts before our readers:

Mr. Rock was dismissed from the Alliance Aeroplane Works, Hammersmith (an offshoot of Waring & Gillows, Ltd.) on June 26th last for blowing a whistle to call a meeting of the employees during working hours. This dismissal was the chief and

immediate cause of the air-craft strike, though other subsidiary matters were mixed up with the affair. On the 11th July it was announced in the Press that the strike had been settled on the following terms:

That we, the National Woodworkers' Air-craft Committee, the London District Air-craft Committee, and other representatives of the workers (both metal and wood) hereby pledge the whole of the men and women now on dispute to loyally abide by the decision of the proposed inquiry if Mr. Rock be allowed to start work as soon as the Ministry of Munitions has assumed the effective control of the factory, and that if Rock be acquitted he shall receive compensation from the date of his dismissal from the Alliance Aeroplane Co. Further we hereby recommend an immediate resumption of work at all shops now on dispute.—("Daily News," July 11, 1918. Italics ours.)

Note the pledge that we have italicised, to abide by the decision of the proposed inquiry. What was that decision? According to the Official Report, dated 15th July, 1918, of Mr. Alfred Hopkinson, who was appointed by the Ministry of Labour to hold the inquiry, it was as follows:

15. The calling of this meeting in manner above mentioned, was the direct cause of Rock's dismissal, and I feel bound to report that Rock's action in the matter was such misconduct as to warrant the immediate termination of the contract of service between him and the company, and that his dismissal was justified.

Acting on this report the Minister of Munitions issued the following statement to the Press:

In view of the finding that Mr. Rock's action in the matter was such misconduct as to warrant the immediate termination of the contract of service between him and the company, and that his dismissal was justified, the Minister considers it his duty, in accordance with the agreement entered into with the responsible trade union officials by which the dispute was settled, to confirm the dismissal of Mr. Rock.—("Daily News," July 22, 1918.)

The above decisions completely prove the correctness of our statement. The strikers returned to work on the pledge of their officials that they would accept the decision of the inquiry. That decision was that the dismissal was justified. On that finding the Minister of Munitions confirmed the dismissal of Rock. Hence the strike failed to save Rock from dismissal.

Mr. Rock says he was reinstated on Monday 12, but he does not say of what month. We may suppose he means the 12th of August. The Inquiry Report is dated 15th July, and the Minister's decision to confirm the dismissal is announced in the Press of the 22nd July. We may presume that Mr. Rock received the Minister's decision somewhere between the two dates. What was his action on receiving this decision? To accept his dismissal as an accomplished fact and to seek other employment. We are informed that the first firm he applied to refused to let him start, after promising him a job, when they found out who he was. Later he obtained employment in the South-Western district of London. Thus he not only accepted the dismissal, but actually started work with another firm, thereby adding further confirmation to the truth of our statement.

ED. COM.

## A DUKE ON HARD WORK.

The "Daily Chronicle" of December 11th ult. gave us the following intoxicating toothful in spite of the no treating order:

### HARD WORK THE REMEDY.

According to the Duke of Northumberland the only firm foundation for reconstruction was self-denial and hard work, and politicians should draw attention to this instead of trying to persuade people that they could get something for nothing.

One would hardly have thought that the noble gentleman would have deemed it necessary to point the way to politicians just at the present moment, at all events, for ever since "reconstruction" showed its head above the political horizon politicians have done precious little but preach toil and abstinence on the part of the workers.

In all the election promises which have recently flooded the country—mere humbug to catch the wage-slave's assent to his own undoing—there is not one but which is found on analysis, if it means anything at all, to mean hard work and penury (for this is what the duke really means by "self-denial") for the working class. All their schemes of "reconstruction," from Adult Education to Afforestation, are schemes for securing hard work for the class which does not include the Duke of Northumberland, while the politicians' idea of the importance of "self-denial" in the scheme of "reconstruction" reveals itself in the provision of a paltry dole equal to

### FOUR DAYS' COST OF THE WAR

to tide their teeming millions of human cattle over the hard times of the "transition period"!

How little respite the political and other hirelings of the master class intend to fall to the lot of the toilers is shown in a score of ways. No windy gasbag from the Welsh Messiah to the Lib-Lab Pensions Minister who declared that no soldier was going to get a pension out of him in order to live without working, has held out any hope of the worker getting something "for nothing." Everywhere the claims of the broken warriors to not by any means "something for nothing," but to something for all they have suffered, and all they have given of health and limb, to keep contemptible and useless dukal parasites safe in their lordly domains, are being repudiated without scruple. No poor cripple, tormented by the agony of his wounds, is there but must, if he has within him any atom of industrial capacity, be "trained" in order that he may yield it up—a paltry additional "something for nothing"—to those who are not satisfied with having robbed him of his joy in life, but desire to "reconstruct" him on the basis of what little strength he has salvaged from the shambles—to pare down his niggard pension. Even

Continued on p. 47.



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28 Union Street, London, W., 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

Twelve Months, post free ...	...	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " "	...	9d.

## The Socialist Standard.

TUESDAY,



JAN. 1, 1919.

## "What will he Do With It?"

The Martial Law General Election has come and gone. As was generally expected, the "Coalition" gang got there. They polled, in the United Kingdom, 5,091,528 votes, against 4,589,486 polled by the non-coalitionists. Thus they had a majority of 5.2 per cent of the votes cast. This astounding majority, we are seriously informed, overwhelmed David L. G. But, as showing how minorities fare under capitalist "democracy," it may be remarked that this five per cent. vote majority gives the Coalition (leaving Ireland out of it) a majority of some 317 seats.

For us, of course, the election was bound to provide consolation prizes. It is sweet to observe that Butcher Asquith has got left, and it is sweeter than saccharine tablets to note that J. R. Macdonald has bitten the dust. The Liberal henchmen have proved who their masters are, alike in the defeat of men like Henderson and Macdonald who have been unfortunate enough to lose their masters' support, and in the victory of men like Thorne who, openly flouting their "labour" crutches, clung frantically to the hand that doles them out their £400 a year, and found, if we may mix the metaphor in a good cause, that they had backed the right horse.

And now Lloyd George goes on to juggle with his promises. Pledged up to the hilt to Home Rule for Ireland, he is going to carry it with a vast Unionist majority! He is going to make a "beautiful new world" with a majority of the stoutest defenders of the old sordid and bestial working-class environment. Well, we hope the workers are about to learn a few useful lessons—and we think they are.

## Another Election Lie.

At the fag end of the election campaign Lloyd George made a bid for the soldiers' votes by declaring for rapid demobilisation and no conscription after the war. As to the first, we shall see presently what he means by that, but as for the second, he has warned us beforehand that he was simply lying.

Earlier in the campaign the wily one said that the question of Conscription depended upon the terms of the peace settlement. He was opposed to Conscription, he said, but if other countries had large armies—why, of course, and so on. He at the same time declared that Britain must retain her navy, which he said is a defensive force.

Now it must be obvious that if Britain is to retain her gigantic navy other countries are going to provide themselves with instruments of defence. The American Naval Secretary soon showed this when he declared that "It was his firm conviction that if the Versailles Conference did not result in a general agreement to put an end to naval construction the United States must bend its energies to the creation of incomparably the greatest navy in the world." ("Star," 31.12.18.)

It is sheer rubbish to talk of the Navy as being a defensive weapon. Lloyd George's persistent claim that without the British Navy the Allies had never won the war proves that it was an offensive instrument of the first order. If it were merely a defensive weapon then it might be extinguished in a general disarmament. But Lloyd George says no, it must be retained. And Secretary Daniels, knowing that it is the factor in the control of trade routes, and therefore of the world market, declares that America does not intend to be shut out of the world market.

And so there we are. The game is about to begin all over again—and nobody knows it better than Lloyd George. So when he says that he is in favour of no-conscription he is only lying to catch votes. He tells us the truth when he says Conscription in this country depends upon what obtains on the Continent, for that means that he is already preparing to institute it as an integral part of the "beautiful new world."

## Confirmation!

"If Germany had waited a single generation she would have had a commercial empire of the world."

Thus spake President Wilson in Rome on Jan. 3rd. Strange, is it not, how our opponents and apologists for the war prove the correctness of our statements regarding the root cause of the conflict and belie their own beatitudes concerning the high ideals which have actuated the Allies. Can it possibly be that they find, when the bill is finally presented, and shows ten million naval and military deaths alone, to say nothing of the millions of other deaths for which the war is responsible, that

the old shallow bunkum of honour and the like is really too absurdly inadequate, and that it better rely on the truth—that it was an economic war?

## THE IMPERIALIST VICTORY

0:0

Capital's Coalition has swept the country at the election. According to reports the Coalition Unionists number 334, Co. Liberals 135 and Co. Labour 10—a total of 479 out of 706 members. The rest consists of 28 Liberals, 62 Labourites, 50 Unionists, 73 Sinn Feiners, 7 Nationalists, and about 7 Independents. The Sinn Feiners are pledged not to take their seats, so they can be deducted, while the 50 Independent Unionists may be counted on to support the Government on most occasions. By adding these to the Coalition and deducting the Sinn Feiners from the Opposition, we get 529 coalitionists against a total combination of 104.

Even this does not complete the tale, for several official Labour men like Hodge, Clynes, and O'Grady, are strong supporters of the war and the Coalition. The Coalition thus has the largest majority ever returned to Parliament.

The most striking feature of the Election is the almost complete destruction of the Liberal Party as represented by the followers of Asquith. Leader and lieutenants alike have been swept aside by the Coalition flood. To cover up this crushing defeat Liberal newspapers are claiming that the Coalition possess seats far in excess of the proportion of votes cast for their men, and that in numerous instances candidates have been elected by a minority of the votes cast. True, but when has a Liberal resigned his seat because he (as in several cases) did not obtain a majority of the votes polled?

On behalf of the Labour Party Philip Snowden and Ramsay Macdonald point jubilantly to the great increase in the votes cast for Labour Party candidates, forgetting to mention that the number of voters on the new register is more than double that at the previous election, and secondly that a much larger number of Labour Party candidates were put forward than ever before. When allowance is made for these facts the figures lose much of their seeming significance. Nor is this all. A large number of the "Labour" votes were given by opponents of the Labour Party's programme. During the brief campaign the "Daily News" repeatedly urged the Liberals to vote for the Labour man where the fight was between a Labourite and a Coalitionist, and in constituencies where a Liberal and a Labourite were opposing a Coalitionist, to vote for the best man, irrespective of label. In some cases Liberal and Tory combined to make the Labour man a present of the seat, as in the case of Crooks, O'Grady, Clynes, Wardle, and others who were returned unopposed. "Colonel" Will Thorne had the support of the official Liberal and Tory

parties, and only had an "Independent" to fight. Hodge at Gorton, Walsh at Ince, Tyson at West Houghton, and Wilkie at Dundee were free from official Liberal or Tory opposition. J. Jones, C. W. Bowerman, J. Sexton, F. Roberts, R. Young, J. Guest, J. Davidson, W. Bromfield, A. Onions, and W. Adamson had no Liberal opposition to face, while Capt. Smith, G. Spencer, R. Richardson, W. Carton, T. Grundy, G. Hirst, J. Williams, F. Rose, C. Edwards, and W. Graham had no official Unionist candidate run against them. This absence of a straight fight against the other parties shows how little the votes cast for these candidates can be claimed, with any justification, as Labour votes.

Neil Maclean, one time Secretary of the S.L.P., now a member of the I.L.P., owes his seat far more to his position as organiser to the Scottish Wholesale Society than to any "Labour" principles he may have professed.

To show it had no "class bias" Holland with Boston returned a "Labour" man—W. S. Royce—who twice previously had contested Spalding as a Unionist and who is a wealthy landowner in the district, though at the moment of writing it is not clear whether he had the official endorsement of the National Labour Party. Arglesey returned the first titled "Labour" man to the House in the person of Brig. Gen. Sir Owen Thomas. We are getting on! We shall have "Labour" Lords next if the "widening process" of the Labour Party succeeds.

To have secured 62 seats out of 368 contests, and that only with all this arrangement and assistance from the capitalist parties, shows how small is the influence and power of the Labour Party.

Despite its affiliation with the Labour Party the I.L.P. has done even worse, for out of 50 candidates that it claims only three were elected. Like its pal the Liberal Party it has lost all its leaders—Snowden, Macdonald, Jowett, Anderson. This shows how much the leaders depended upon Liberal votes for the seats they held.

The intense disappointment felt by them at this is shown when Macdonald declares—

Unfortunately the Labour Party lacks in men... who would enable it to perform the functions of an official Parliamentary Opposition.—"Manchester Guardian."

That is adepts in Parliamentary trickery and bargaining like himself. Snowden says of the new men:

There are amongst them some of the most reactionary of the Trade Union leaders. There are amongst them men who have been most prominent amongst the Trade Union leaders in supporting every reactionary proposal the Government put forward.—"Labour Leader," 2.1.19.

And as the I.L.P., by its alliance with the Labour Party, has supported these men in their actions, it is clear that the real trouble is not the reactionary character of these men, but the fact that they are "in" while Snowden & Co. are "out."

The National Socialist Party—the Hyndman-Lee section that broke away from the B.S.P. on the question of the war—claims eleven candidates, of



whom six were returned. But with the exception of Dan Irving, these successful candidates were run by the official Labour parties. They are J. O'Grady, W. Thorne, J. Jones, Ben Tillett, and A. Hayday. All are prominent T.U. officials, ran as "Labour" men, and the N.S.P. had no influence whatever on their return. Irving's long career of trickery and bargaining in Burnley has at last been rewarded. He will, of course, obey the orders of his political masters, the capitalists.

Both Liberals and I.L.P. are stating that Lloyd George did not desire so overwhelming a majority as it places him completely in the hands of the Unionists. Our Election Manifesto had already pointed out that he was the tool of the Imperialists and was completely in their hands before the Election, and therefore he will be only continuing in the same position in the new Parliament. The "Daily Mail" admits this when it says (31.12.18):—

Sir George Younger Lord Downham (Mr. Hayes Fisher) and Mr. Bonar Law have manoeuvred our gallant little Welsh wizard into a position in which he is almost entirely dependent upon the votes of those whom he so vigorously denounced at Limehouse a few years ago.

No one knows this better than L.L. George himself, but he hopes to persuade some people that he is independent, and repeats the trick he played in 1906 of threatening to resign if the "great" measures promised are not carried through. Speaking at Carnarvon on Jan. 1st he said:—

If the Government did not do their best to fulfill the promises made he would no longer be head of the Government, but would go back to the people and ask for a renewal of their confidence.—"Daily News," 2.1.19.

This is just as much cant and humbug as his similar statements in 1906. The last Government broke all its pledges, but it had the vigorous support of L.L. George in all its dastardly actions. The same will be true in the future. Whatever his paymasters order him to do he will carry out, no matter what promises are broken or what crimes are contemplated.

This Election has been a great victory for the Imperialists. Riding the wave of relief and excitement consequent upon the signing of the Armistice, they have regained political power with a largely increased majority, and will be able to carry out their schemes practically unhampered. The workers will presently see their new position is worse than the old one, that the masters are more strongly entrenched than ever, and that the struggle to retain the old standard of living will be intensified and more bitter than before.

When they apply this knowledge they will set to work to return a majority of their own representatives to Parliament for the purpose of wresting power from the master class and using that power to establish the common ownership of the means of life, whereby all will be able to enjoy life in the fullest sense of the word. J. FITZGERALD.

## MILNER TRIES TO EXCUSE "INTERVENTION."

The Government are now making a frantic effort to throw dust in the eyes of the people on the question of what they are pleased to call the "British intervention in Russia." The Secretary of State, Lord Milner, claims to have received a letter on the subject from a correspondent, and whether this is a put-up job or not, his statement purporting to be an answer to this letter is such a wishy-washy production as to be little else than a subject for derision and laughter.

Lord Milner states that:

... the Bolsheviks, whatever their ultimate object, were in fact assisting our enemies in every possible way.

It was owing to their action that thousands of German troops were let loose to hurl themselves against our men on the Western Front. It was owing to their betrayal that Roumania, with all its rich resources of grain and oil, fell into the hands of the Germans.

These are deliberate lies. The facts are plain enough to view. The Russians were beaten to a standstill under the regime of that advanced and enlightened ruler whom our bosses' papers at that time referred to as "our Gallant Ally," and some time previously had honoured with the name we still love to know him by—Bloody Nick.

It was under Nick's generals that the "Russian Steam Roller" was reduced to impotence. The poor, unlettered moujik played his unwilling part in the war "according to plan." He was the cheapest cannon-fodder in the whole arena, in the sense that there were enormous numbers of him, and he was probably the only soldier in the whole conflict who could be driven half armed and ill equipped into the slaughter merely as a stop-gap, a mass of quivering, valueless flesh to keep the "enemy" busy while rival generals and statesmen squabbled over the questions command, and personal and "national" dignity.

So, in spite of the Allied liars who are casting about for excuses for attacking those who are threatening capitalist interests in Russia, defeat, complete and irretrievable, was the legacy left the Bolsheviks by their feudal and capitalist predecessors. Even had they desired it; even had the capitalist revolution not completed the ruin of the giant Russian military machine, the Bolsheviks had not the means to carry on the war against the powerful, victorious, and perfectly equipped German host. Already, under the capitalist Premier, Prince Lvoff, in 1914, the Russian forces had begun to melt away. Skulking Kerensky and his fellow butchers tried to keep them together by the usual means of wholesale slaughter, but their failure was ignominious. It was not for want of the will to murder that they failed. "General Korniloff

as given orders that deserters and runaways are to be shot," declared the "Daily Chronicle" on the 4th July 1917. The war-mongers had their opportunity, and their failure proves beyond all doubt, that peace was the ardent desire of the Russian peoples. The very success of the Bolsheviks is based on this almost universal desire of the people of Russia for peace. No honest man with a knowledge of the facts can contend that the Bolsheviks find their chief support among those who understand Bolshevik principles. They found a war-sick people—a people who had been driven to war by organised military brutality and tyranny—they promised them peace and—wonder among politicians!—kept their promise. And this our British capitalist apologists call treachery, and helping the Germans.

The fact is that neither the Bolsheviks nor the Russian people ever made any promises to the Allies, or entered into any compact or treaty with them. All such contracts were entered into by the capitalist gang. These ghouls did not represent the people, and the Allies knew it. They did not worry in those days about "only negotiating with governments representative of the people," nor did they think it "an obligation of honour"—(what language from one of the central figures of the South African outrage) "to save" those with whom they entered into the treaties. For they rushed to congratulate those who overthrew their allies, co-brothers, and partners, Bloody Nick and his circle.

They never entered into their heads when they expressed gratification at the downfall of their partners in this awful crime, that "it would be an inominable betrayal, contrary to every British instinct of honour and humanity" to, "simply because our own immediate purposes have been served, leave them to the tender mercies of their enemies."

All the Allies' reasons for invading Russia, as set forth in Lord Milner's letter, since they turn on the alleged German exploitation of Russian resources, cease to afford any pretext for the continued occupation of Russian territory by the Allies in view of the present military position of Germany. The only shred of excuse offered is that they must not leave the "thousands of Russians" who, "in the course of this Allied intervention" have "taken up arms and fought on the side of the Allies," to "the tender mercies of their enemies" before they have had time to arm, train, and organise so as to be strong enough to defend themselves. This cant might go down but for the light shed upon it by other events. These (probably mythical) Russians are not the only people who have fought on the side of the Allies. To use the phrase Lord Milner is very fond of, "I say nothing of the poor, cast-off crippled soldier at home abandoned to the tender mercies of private charity. There are others. The Armenians, for example, they fought on the side of the Allies, yet the latter were not scrupled to abandon the poor remnants

of an agonised people to the tender mercies of their enemies, the vengeful official Turk.

What Lord Milner really means can be read in his reference to the arming, training, and organising of the Russians who have fought on the Allied side. These Russians are the Russian capitalists and their hireling butchers. It is to arm and aid these, and to establish capitalist rule in the vast domains now under Bolshevik administration that our lads are now being kept from their homes. It is to assist in crushing out a working-class rising, that British sailors are firing at Bolsheviks on the shores of the Black Sea.

A. E. J.

## A DUKE ON HARD WORK.—Continued.

the blinded soldier is not prey beneath the contempt of these ghouls, and St. Dunstan's "reconstructs" on the foundation of "hard work," and not of "something for nothing."

It is only the master class who get anything for nothing, and they get everything for nothing. This "reconstruction" is

THEIR RECONSTRUCTION,

and it is quite true that it must be founded upon hard work and "self-denial." But it will be the hard work and the forced abstinence of the wage-slaves, not of the Duke of Northumberland and his like.

There are signs, however, of the approach of the day when we, the workers of the world, will undertake a "reconstruction," and it will be upon the foundation of the labour of all who are capable of labour, including those who are quite strange to work nowadays. No dukal coronet will then protect loose jawed humbugs from sampling the work they are so fond of prescribing for the workers, and the Duke of Northumberland may yet support the "dignity of labour" with a scavenger's broom in the glorious day when, in William Morris's beautiful words—

"... a man shall work and bethink him, and rejoice in the deeds of his hand,  
Nor yet come home in the even too faint and weary to stand.  
Men in that time a-coming shall work and have no fear  
For to-morrow's lack of earning and the hunger-wolf a-near.  
I tell you this for a wonder, that no man then shall be glad  
Of his fellow's fall and mishap to snatch at the work he had.  
For that which the worker winneth shall then be his indeed,  
Nor shall half be reaped for nothing by him that sowed no seed.

B. B.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 28, Union Street, W.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.



**SELF-CONVICTED THIEVES.**

Though the great Business War is over the sun is still shining for the "profiteer," and he is sedulously "making hay" while opportunity offers. His stereotyped reply to all expostulation is that material is scarce and wages high. Both these statements may be correct, but how any combination of them within present experience works out to the effect that two-and-half lbs of galvanised iron, wrought to the form of a common housewife's pail, at one time hanging fire at 6½d., should cost the present scribe 4s. 9d., wants a bit of understanding. But here is a little example which shows whether inflated prices are due to greater costs or to downright thieving.

During the recent election Parliamentary candidates had released to them paper, envelopes, cards and so on. They got their permits, took them to their printers, and the latter, upon presenting them to the paper merchants, were supplied with the stuff.

But the galling part is this: the paper and other materials were released to the candidates at prices which were less than half those asked of the printer in the ordinary way. Thus paper known in the trade as "news," was released at 5½d. a lb, while the printer has to pay 11d. to 1s. 3d. for an inferior quality. (The pre-war price was about 1½d. a lb.) Envelopes were released at 5s. 6d. per thousand which the printer for his ordinary business would have to pay 12s. to 17s. for.

Are the paper merchants losing on this deal? Are they themselves bearing the "great advance in the cost of materials and labour" out of gratitude to the politicians who allow them to carry on their shameless thievery with impudent impunity? They might well do so, but it is hardly likely that they are. No, nobody is losing on this reduction of prices to election candidates. That it has been done is simply a confession that the magnates of the paper trade are seizing the opportunity provided by the war to plunder on a scale they could never have dreamed of before August 1914. They boasted quite early on, when they were deliberately holding up supplies for higher prices, that they would have the price up to 1s. a lb before the war was finished. But they have long since surpassed this, and in some cases have more than doubled it.

Down with the thieves! Down with the canting humbugs who urge the workers on to butchery in the name of patriotism while they scheme in their palatial offices to wax fat on the reek of the shambles and wring loot out of the agonised needs of their war-stricken victims! The agents of these ghouls are shouting "Germany begins to pay!" It is time that we had a squaring up of accounts with the thieves nearer home.

JACKO.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY  
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

**Declaration of Principles****THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 174 VOL. 15.] LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1919. [MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

### HOW THEY SUPPORT OUR CONTENTIONS.

In the December 1918 SOCIALIST STANDARD we stated that if a General Election were held in Germany the working class there, having the vast majority of the votes, could place a Socialist Government in power should they desire to work for the establishment of Socialism. An Election has now been held, and its results must be exceedingly disappointing to those who claim that the riots in Berlin and other towns showed that the German working class were ready—nay, eager—to see Socialism brought into existence.

The Press reports give the following as the result of the Election:

Majority Socialists ...	...	164 seats.
Independent Socialists ...	...	24 "
German Democratic Party ...	...	77 "
National People's Party ...	...	34 "
Christian People's Party ...	...	88 "
German People's Party ...	...	23 "
Other Parties ...	...	11 "
Total		421 "

The "Daily News" (24.1.19) divides the above parties into two groups, the first three forming what it calls the "Left," and the remainder the "Right." But this division conceals, rather than explains, the real position of the various parties.

The "Christian People's Party" is the old Clerical Centre Party wearing a new name in the attempt to trim its sails to fit the new conditions. The "National People's Party" is the old Conservative and Junker organisation with a new label to hide its old crimes.

The German People's Party is composed of the large industrial and financial capitalists and has made a rather poor show, due, doubtless to the wages disputes raging throughout Germany.

The German Democratic Party is made up of Liberals and Republicans and corresponds approximately to the Asquithian Liberal Party here.

Despite the "Daily News" division all the above

parties are supporters and defenders of the capitalist system and are utterly opposed to the abolition of wage slavery. Combined they hold 222 seats, and if we add the 11 seats of the other anti-working class parties there are 233 avowedly capitalist members against 188 so-called Socialist members. But still this does not complete the survey.

For years we have pointed out that the Social Democratic Party of Germany—now called the "Majority Socialists"—was not a Socialist party. Its persistent support of the capitalist parties at elections, coupled with its advocacy of capitalist reforms, marked it off as merely a reform party similar to the Labour Party in this country, though it carried a Socialist name. And there was another important fact connected with its growth.

The capitalist class in Germany has always been somewhat nervous of the working class there, having, as Engels points out, something to learn from the English capitalist class in this respect. This nervousness was shown in various repressive measures culminating in Bismarck's Anti-Socialist laws. Repressive measures for the working class, however, also hit the small capitalists and traders in their operations. These latter, who usually form an active portion of the Liberal Party, found the main body of their organisation too timid to fight over these measures, and saw them slink behind the more determined Junker section when there were any signs of trouble ahead. Mr. Small Capitalist had to look for another organisation that was really prepared for the Liberal reforms, and it was at hand in the shape of the Social Democratic Party. Since the days of its famous "Gotha Programme," so trenchantly trounced by Marx, it had always fought for these reforms, and had even challenged Bismarck's rulings. So the small capitalists joined this organisation in large numbers till the total votes ran into millions.

It is as clear as noon-day that these votes were



neither Socialist nor intended to help forward the cause of Socialism. The "acid test" came with the war. Then, as the Labour Party and Hyndman section here, the German Social Democratic Party supported this capitalist war on their side. Only a small number of the Left wing protested, and Karl Liebknecht was slimed with the praise of the capitalist Press of this country, which, since the signing of the Armistice, have used the foulest language at their command to blacken him in the eyes of the workers. Then came the split and the formation of the "Independent Socialist Party" by the Left wing referred to above.

With the fall of the Kaiser on the signing of the Armistice the Junkers went temporarily under a cloud, and the various sections of the Liberals joined with the Social Democrats to carry on in the interval.

Karl Liebknecht's attempt to rouse the workers to seize political power for themselves as a class met with considerable opposition even in his own stronghold, Berlin. This showed how small was the number of the German working class who were ready to assist in establishing Socialism. The number who understand it must, of course, be smaller still.

The German Election has shown, with the cold, relentless logic of figures, how much *Socialist* propaganda still must be done in Germany, as elsewhere, before the working class will be in a fit state, and ready, to establish Socialism.

While the old Clerical Party and the Junkers have tried to hide their disreputable pasts under new labels, the Liberals have come out with a party of their own—the German Democratic Party. In spite of this many Liberals have been reassured by the actions of the "Majority Socialists" during the interval, and have maintained their allegiance with them. Hence the "Majority Socialist" vote cannot be claimed to be more than a mixture of advanced Radical and ordinary Labour votes.

Due to their action in opposing the later war-credits the "Independent Socialist" vote is a much more reliable index to the number of Socialists in Germany. Even here, however, the breaking away of the Spartacus group adds to the difficulty of forming a sound judgment till more detailed information is available. Until then even the most optimistic who have any acquaintance with German conditions, cannot claim more than the 24 "Independent Socialist" members as an expression of the desire for Socialism on the part of the working class in Germany.

There, as in all capitalist countries, the fight for the Social Revolution has yet to take place. J.F.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 28, Union Street, W.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

## PAST CLASS STRUGGLES.

The change from the Feudal system to the Commercial or Capitalist regime was the instance of political struggles which brought about the English Revolution, the French Revolution, and the German Empire. The development of commercialism was also accompanied by risings of the peasantry. We will consider first of all the most important of these risings in the order of their occurrence.

After the Roman Empire spread and absorbed the greater part of the known world, it became more and more unwieldy. The increasing wealth of its constituent parts bred a tendency towards local government and a revolt against the exactions of the Papal Court. The rising bourgeoisie of the towns found themselves heavily drained by taxation to support a power that was becoming a hindrance instead of an aid to them. The religion of the Roman Empire, with its numerous holidays, feasting, and taxations for religious purposes, stood in the way of the full and free exploitation of the labouring class by the fore-runners of the factory lords. Their opposition consequently expressed itself in a rebellion against some of the tenets in the creed of the times.

All social movements except that of the modern proletariat, have had the glamour of religion cast over them, and the exploiters of the peasantry and sweaters of the town labourers were not behind-hand in finding their religious apologist. In this capacity they were well served by the time-serving Martin Luther. Before Luther came to the fore, however, the commercial class had made considerable progress in England; we will, therefore, proceed to outline the conditions that led up to the English Peasants' Revolt, which arose as a consequence of the emergence of Capitalism.

When the Normans under William landed in England they found the manorial system of land tenure in vogue. Three quarters of the people lived on agriculture; the rest were townfolk, gentry, and Churchmen. There were 9,250 villages or manors, three-fifths of each being waste, i.e., untilled common land, one-fifth pasture, and one-fifth arable. After the Conquest each manor was held by a lord or baron owing allegiance to the king. Nominally all the land of England belonged to the Crown. In actual fact, however, the baron had control of his particular property. Nearly half the population were villeins or peasant proprietors, tilling land in separate plots with rights to the use of the common land, and obliged to till the land of the lord of the manor in return for his military protection.

The commencement of the Crusades in the 13th century brought about a change in the relations of lords and peasants. Foreign trade and the taste for finery were developed through intercourse with the East, while the expenses of the crusading

expeditions accentuated the need for money on the part of the lords. They consequently introduced the system of commuting rents in kind and labour rents, for money rents, the latter becoming general by the time of the Great Plague.

In 1348 the Black Death swept over England, carrying away one-third of the population. There consequently arose a great shortage of labour and the labourers found themselves in the "Golden Age" of the wage slave. Wages rose to a very high level. This state of affairs did not suit the landowners, so, with the help of their friends, the legal fraternity, various measures were tried, among them the "Statute of Labourers," to keep down wages. Heavy penalties were to be inflicted on those who demanded higher wages than before the Plague. All their efforts were useless, and finally they hit upon the plan of driving the peasants back into villeinage. They tried to enforce the exaction of the old labour rents, in spite of the fact that the peasants had either purchased their holdings or had had the rents commuted into money rents, while the free labourers had either purchased their freedom or been granted manumission. Incontestable documentary evidence (which in most cases did not exist) was demanded to excuse the peasants from labour rents. The revolt of the peasantry all over England, consequent upon these conditions, was precipitated by the harsh method of collecting the poll tax.

Luxurious living and disastrous military undertakings had brought the treasury of the proprietary classes low. "The French war ran its disastrous course: one English fleet was beaten by the Spaniards, a second sunk by a storm and a campaign in the heart of France ended, like its predecessors, in disappointment and ruin. It was to defray the cost of these failures that the parliament granted a fresh subsidy, to be raised by means of a poll tax on every person in the realm. To such a tax the poorest contributed as large a sum as the wealthiest, and the injustice of such an exaction set England on fire from sea to sea."—"A Short History of the English People," J. R. Green, Vol. 1, p. 236.

For a long time previous to this the Lollards, the poor priests who were disseminating the teachings of Wycliff against the established religion, had taken up the cause of the peasants. They tramped through the country spreading rebellious views among the labourers. "The storm which no politician of the time anticipated, burst on June 10th, 1381. The uprising of the upland folk was simultaneous. It extended from the coast of France to Scarborough, all through the Eastern towns."

On the West it extended from Hampshire to Lancashire."—"Six Centuries of Work and Wages," p. 256.

What followed is illuminatingly summarised by

Gibbins in his "Industrial History of England," p. 78:

Almost simultaneously the peasants showed their combined strength, and a large body of them under Wat Tyler marched upon London. It is well known how they met the young King Richard II. at Mile End, and demanded of him the petition which shows the real meaning of the movement: "We will that you free us for ever, us and our lands," they asked, "and that we be never named or held as villeins." "I grant it," said the King, with regal diplomacy, and they believed him. But they very soon learned how vain a thing it is to put one's trust in princes for after the peasant armies in the various parts of England had quieted down, and the Essex men among others claimed the fulfillment of his royal promise, Richard openly broke faith. "Villeins you were," said the King, "and villeins you are. In bondage shall you abide, and that not your old bondage, but a worse!"

After the promises of reform the peasants dispersed to their homes, satisfied that their demands were going to receive attention. This was what the ruling powers were waiting for. They proceeded to exact vengeance for their temporary humiliation.

The promises exacted by force were broken as soon as that force had disappeared. Wherever the peasants demanded the fulfillment of the pledges they were met with threats and hangings. A large army was put into the field by the ruling classes and the revolt was punished by the hanging of Ball, Straw, and thousands of their followers.

I would recommend a study of the result of this rising to the "Economic power" theorists. While the peasantry were organised into a fighting force they held the key to the situation and could dictate terms. But they had to depend for their living upon tilling the soil, and had therefore to disperse to their homes after being a short time under arms. As soon as they dispersed their power was gone, and they could be massacred at the leisure of the masters. The ruling classes through history have laid to heart this fact, and have always endeavoured to keep an organised force at their disposal to put down discontent. It must also be borne in mind that the military power has undergone a tremendous development since the time of the Peasant's Revolt. The day of mob marches on London has long since gone by. The only way for the working class to become the ruling power is to gain control of the permanent fighting machine so that they can use it for their own ends.

The suppression of the Peasants' Revolt did not result in a return to villeinage. Other economic forces were operating to nullify the effect of the Plague. The labourers were again brought to heel by the introduction and rapid growth of sheep farming on a large scale (which necessitated the employment of a comparatively small amount of labour) and the rapid increase of the labouring population consequent upon the higher wages and resulting plenitude of the means of life.

The discoveries in the 15th century of Columbus, Continued on p. 55.



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles and correspondence submitted for insertion therein should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28 Union Street, London, W., 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

Twelve Months, post free ..	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " "	9d

## The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1919.

## WHERE WE STAND.

If it was ever true that "all the world is a stage," in was never more true than it is to-day. In Russia and Germany tragedy; here, at home, comedy that may become tragedy of the first water if certain mad-caps have their way. That an attempt is being made to establish proletarian domination in Eastern Europe and Western Asia on a scale without parallel in the world's history seems to have turned the heads of a large number of proletarians in countries outside those in which the attempt is being made, and it is a matter upon which it is our duty to speak.

The January issue of the "Socialist," the official organ of the Socialist Labour Party, carries a "Manifesto" which may form a convenient introduction to our subject. This manifesto is put forward as "A Plea for the Reconsideration of Socialist Tactics and Organisation." In reality it is a proposal to imitate in this country the policy and tactics which, it is alleged, are being pursued in Russia, with, of course, such amendments and alterations as the "dead hand of the past," that is, the claims and policy which the S.L.P. has put forward and followed with such conspicuous failure for some years now, suggest. But, be it said, there are important abandonments of positions and tactics also, of which we shall have more to say later on.

The manifesto urges all Socialists to "re-examine our previous attitude and activities;" it pleads: "Let us decide whether this policy does not bring our movement into line with the revolutionary working class of Russia and elsewhere." And the leading article in the same paper, after much vapouring about the Bolshevik movement in

Russia, and the revolutionary workers in Germany, says: "Elsewhere in the 'Socialist' we publish a manifesto which seeks to outline a new basis for the revolutionary movement, and which will enable the masses to act." [Italics not ours.] And in another place says: "The revolutionary crisis is here now." What the manifesto lacks in definite pronouncement as to its ends and aims is supplied by these statements, but if something still more definite is needed, then it is to be found in the assertion in the early part of the same leader that: "At this time last year we, in conjunction with the German workers, pledged ourselves to support the Bolsheviks in Russia with all our power. The German workers have carried out their pledge, but we have not."

So, the moral is, that the Revolutionaries of this country are to copy the Spartacists, and the steps which certain prominent S.L.P. men are taking to organise meetings, and what transpires thereat, confirms the view that nothing less than the immediate challenging of the military might of the capitalist class in this country is the object the S.L.P. has in view in publishing this manifesto. Indeed, they say: "We are entering upon a year which is either going to make or unmake the immediate realisation of the International Socialist Republic." What could be plainer?

Now, what is the actual situation? Events which are within the knowledge of most people to-day, found Russia in a peculiar state of chaos. The capitalist class of that country at the moment that should have been their hour of emancipation, discovered themselves an ill-organised, or perhaps one might better say unorganised social class faced with a situation calling for the highest organised effort in order to cope with it. If ever the revolutionary workers, imbued with the idea of seizing power without the formality of creating a class-conscious proletariat, had the ghost of a chance, it was then. They determined to take the opportunity, and as far as we know, and, indeed, from such indications as can hardly be discredited, they appear to have carried on their effort so far with great skill and success.

But to claim that their battle is won, or that eventual success is within reach of the Bolsheviks, is to claim that which there is no evidence to support. On what do the Bolshevik leaders depend for their strength? Certainly not on a class-conscious working class. To talk about the millions of Socialist books and pamphlets being printed in Russia is beside the question, since 70 per cent. of the people will need to be taught to read them. The peasantry—the backbone of the country, on whom the fate of the movement must ultimately rest—cannot understand Socialism, for in the first place they are generally illiterate and cannot have read Socialist literature; in the second place they are so isolated and have been so under official

guardianship, that it is altogether unlikely that Socialist propaganda has been carried on among them. How is it likely, then, that they can conceive any advantage arising from common ownership of the land? How is it possible that they can see sound reasoning in the proposal that they shall grow the food for the whole people and receive in return such few products of the factories as they have need of? Their wants end with their few simple tools and their boots. All else, practically, they produce for themselves, after the manner of people in their stage of development; and the idea that they are going to give allegiance to the proposal that they shall feed Russia for boots and tools is ridiculous. At present they are, so far as our information goes, enamoured of the idea that each peasant may have as much land as he can till without hired labour; but the natural corollary of this is that each will till as little as he can keep himself and his family upon, and the few calls he makes on the outside world, and pays for with his products, will not be sufficient to maintain the townspeople and the revolutionary armies. When the Bolsheviks try to square this matter the peasants will in all probability be ready to listen to the cry of the first capitalist party that promises land without restriction and the exchange of the capitalist world instead of the lopsided exchange of goods produced in commonly-owned factories for food produced on privately owned land.

It is ridiculous to try and imagine Socialist productive conditions in the towns and the productive conditions of feudal communism in the country. The first is the child of highly fertile labour due to technical advance. The second is the result, and in its reaction the cause, of low productive capacity. The first gives men leisure through social effort and the conquest of nature, the second fixes on them the toil of individual labour and poor technical resources. The first responds to social needs; the second only to private. The first has no idea of any other value than that of utility in satisfying social needs; the second none but that of satisfying private needs. There can be, therefore, no satisfactory basis for exchange. The incongruous property conditions divides society into two classes, of whom the vast majority are peasants "each owning as much land as he can till without hired assistance," and interested in producing as little as possible beyond his own requirements, and demanding the utmost return for what he has to sell. In the absence of the appraisal of values through competition as under capitalism the rate of exchange between the communal products of the towns and the individual products of the country must be the subject of arrangement. It hence is removed to the realm of politics. A class struggle, therefore, arises, expressing itself as a political struggle for supremacy in the adjustment of antagonistic interests.

Yet the Bolsheviks are powerless to place the land on any more satisfactory footing. The wants of the Russian peasantry are not sufficiently great, nor their agricultural means and methods sufficiently fertile, to enable them to carry the Socialist Revolution on their backs. Just as Socialism must be international because the world is necessary to Socialism, so no section of Society can be ripe for Socialism until its needs extend beyond its own confines—until the whole world is necessary to it. Nor, while the average corn yield is only four times the amount of grain sown can Socialism offer a peasantry the equality it must afford to all. Only when they need more of the amenities of life, and their means of culture have been brought to such a level as will leave them leisure after producing the social food, will they be in a position to welcome Socialism—and even then they must understand it.

That the Bolsheviks realise this is quite possible. But as long as they are faced with this difficulty it is madness for the revolutionary element in other countries to talk as though the Russian rebels had established Socialism, or even overthrown capitalism, in Russia. As a matter of fact it appears that the Russian capitalists have their nuclei in many districts, gathered under the protection of the internationalist capitalists. The result of the recent German elections will give these reactionaries a further opportunity of safeguarding the capitalist institutions in those places where they are threatened. Therefore it is madness to proceed as though Bolshevism had established the foundation of the International Socialist Commonwealth.

But even had they succeeded in establishing a Socialist Republic (and there is no evidence that they have even attempted to do so yet) there is still to be considered the different conditions prevailing in other countries. In England the workers do not find the capitalist class disorganised, nor in France, or America, or any of the Allied countries. Even in Germany, with all the odium of military failure upon them, there is no sign that the capitalists have not a grip upon the situation that will pull them through. To say in the face of this that "We are entering upon a year which is either going to make or unmake the immediate realisation of the International Socialist Republic" is to utter balderdash.

Four short years after even "The Socialist" was advocating the prosecution of the capitalist war, the madcaps of the S.L.P. think that British soldiers, with four years of iron discipline upon them, flushed with victory and the flattery that is showered on victors, would fail to support against a mob of rioters, that system they have fought so valiantly for. "We need a movement of active men and women who are not afraid to live dangerously," they cry, who so late as 1915 were urging men and women of the working class to "live dangerously"



in their masters' war service. If they think that, four years of war having brought them round to OUR view of the purely capitalist nature of the war, the rest of the working class have made a like mental advance, they have their answer in the last General Election.

The "Manifesto," in imitation of a prominent capitalist politician, lays down a programme of "14 points," the third of which runs:

The defence of the National Socialist Republic may be necessary to prevent any Imperialist Capitalist State attempting to crush the freedom of the workers in any land, consequently the Army and Navy shall be democratically controlled.

This presupposes that when "men and women who are not afraid to live dangerously" have established the "National Socialist Republic" in this country, there may be existing "Imperialist Capitalist States" in other countries. Here enters a factor which knocks the bottom clean out of the S.L.P.'s "Plea for the Reconsideration of Socialist Tactics and Organisation." For, granted that the fullest possible success attended the efforts of the rebels, they would then be up against the fact that, under conditions which must even then prevail, the country cannot feed itself. No army or navy could avail. The "Imperialist Capitalist States" could simply starve the "National Socialist Republic" into surrender. Even Germany, with a few paltry U boats, nearly accomplished this trick against capitalist Britain and the mighty navies of the world.

No, England, of all countries, is not the one to lead the way in the matter of overthrowing capitalist domination. At the quickest a year must elapse before the home-grown food supply could be increased sufficiently to support the nation. It is hardly conceivable that it could be accomplished in that time, but long before that time every man, woman, and child in the "National Socialist Republic" would have "lived hungrily" and died of starvation.

Before leaving the "Manifesto" it may be noted that the S.L.P. have abandoned the old I.W.W. position of organisation by industries. Locality, now, is the very keystone to the arch of social organisation. They say:

In order to find the social needs, some machinery is required that reflects the social side of life as apart from the time spent in production. . . . In the present geographical allocation of wards, there exists a basis upon which such machinery could be erected. . . . Each ward would also be entitled to have a delegate upon the local Federal Council of the district, which latter body would be composed of one delegate from each ward and one delegate from each shop, yard, or similar area of production. [Italics ours.]

How long it does take some people to discover the absurdity of their sophistries! We pointed out the idiocy of organisation by industries years ago.

There are many other points in the "Plea" calling

for criticism, but we have only space for this last. We are told that

Given the necessary desires and social requirements of the people, our duty is to propagate and establish the means of their fulfilment. . . . all factories and plants of production should be organised in such a way that each would have its complete committees of delegates drawn directly from the various departments, each separately delegated to carry out the instructions of the workers engaged therein.

So it is not the workers as a whole who are to control production, but the industrial groups. This necessarily means that the social requirements are subservient to the industrial side of the system, which is absurd. It is hardly for us here and now to concern ourselves deeply with the details of a social system which is still some distance ahead. But it is obvious that the body responsible for the social liabilities must control production. The responsible body is the community, not the workshop groups. Supervisors must carry out the instructions of the community, as expressed through their elected administrators. It is easy to see why the S.L.P. take the opposite view. They are, and always have been, opportunists of the first water. At the moment they are anxious to exploit the Shop Steward movement. So they commit themselves to the statement that the new society must be built up within the old, "using the existing organisations for the same end." They thus find a useful function for the Shop Steward movement—they to whom well within living memory anything savouring of the "pure and simple" trade union was anathema!

In an attack no doubt directed against us, though no names are mentioned, the "Socialist" says:

Historic and political development is an ever-changing process, and no political organisation, particularly a revolutionary organisation, can draw up a code of tactics which will last, "not for an age, but for all time." The hide-bound, inactive, and intolerant doctrinaire can always be detected by the claim that he devotedly and unswervingly follows the tactics which he embraced 15 years ago.

Well, strangely enough, 15 years ago WE drew up declaration of Principles, and "embraced" a line of policy and tactics based thereon. We had followed that line for 11 years when the war broke out. It was a testing time for all. The S.L.P. went into the test, as we did. How did the ramping, flexible, "damn-the-rudder-trim-the-sails" party and the "hide-bound, inactive, and intolerant doctrinaire" respectively emerge from the ordeal? We give here extracts from the official organs of both parties:

. . . no interests are at stake justifying the shedding of a single drop of working-class blood. . . . Having no quarrel with the working class of any country, we extend to our fellow workers

I cannot say definitely what the official attitude of the Party is.—(The Editor, "The Socialist," Nov. 1914. SHALL I FIGHT? I cannot understand the stand being taken by some

of all lands the expression of our goodwill and Socialist fraternity. . . .—"The War and the Socialist Position." "Socialist Standard," Sept. 1914.)

Socialists of refusing to kill. . . . I do not regard this question as a test of one's sincerity as a Socialist. . . . So long as the other fellow remains armed and sets out to make mincemeat of me I reserve the right to retaliate. —(The Editor, "The Socialist," Dec. 1914.)

As now, the S.L.P. organ wanted men and women to "live dangerously," but then it was to be in butchering their German fellow workers. For months the columns of "The Socialist" presented every capitalist argument in support of the war, and the Party which speak with such authority on the details of the future society were lost in face of a simple situation that had long threatened them. The "hide-bound doctrinaires" can still reiterate the words with which they met the outbreak of the great butchery—can the S.L.P.? We can stand unashamed before those Russian revolutionaries who reproached the "International" and charged it with treachery—can the S.L.P.?

It is not at all remarkable that the S.L.P., which have pretty well boxed the political compass in their 17 years or so of life, ever finding themselves on the wrong track, should desire to reconsider their position. As for us, we are satisfied to go on in the direction we have always followed, more convinced than ever that the emancipation of the working class can only be the work of a class-conscious proletarian organised for their task, and that therefore our mission is first to educate, then to organise.

The workers must make rebels of the masters before resorting to armed force.

#### PAST CLASS STRUGGLES.—Continued.

Cabot, and Vasco da Gama, together with the Crusades and, later, the buccaneering exploits of the English sailors, gave a tremendous impetus to foreign trade. Sheep farming had become the mainstay of the English trade, and the profits made out of this lucrative industry set the land-owners thinking out schemes for its expansion. They set about doing three things. They evicted as many as possible of their smaller tenants; they raised the rents of their larger tenants so that ordinary farming could hardly be made to pay; and finally they commenced enclosing the common lands. The condition of the people about that time was further adversely affected by the debasing of the coinage and the resultant rise in prices.

It may be interesting to remind the reader at this juncture that at one time, as we have already shown, three-fifths of the land of England was the common property of the whole people. As the population of England now, with the exception of a comparatively small class, is landless, it therefore appears that the ruling class have, in actual fact, robbed the working people of three-fifths of England since the Norman Conquest. GILMAC.

#### A DIRTY LIE.

In the "Daily Chronicle" of Jan. 24th appears the following, purporting to be sent by that paper's "diplomatic correspondent." It occurs in a pronouncement dealing with Wilson's proposal to ask Russian representatives to a conference on one of Prince's Islands.

The conditions of existence in Russia were shown to be appalling; the nationalisation of women and other facts of Bolshevik rule pointed to a species of organised depravity.

Whoever this "diplomatic correspondent" may be he is a filthy-minded liar. His statement that the Russian Revolutionaries have nationalised women is so ridiculous one would think only the mental and moral dregs of the bourgeoisie could swallow it. It bears the impress of the organised campaign of slander and villification which the parasitic ruling class invariably launch against any section of the working class which has the temerity to challenge its supremacy. Such stuff is written for working-class consumption. Our masters, arguing that a class which will for ages permit themselves to be plundered by another class must be fools indeed, never hesitate to show their contempt for working-class intelligence, and too often they are justified by results. But in this instance, surely, they have reached a little too deep into their mental cesspool in their eagerness for unnameable filth to throw at those they are at a loss to combat in any other way. The muck they have reached up reveals its source in its stench. It stinks of capitalism. It reeks of the system in which, as notorious cases at present before the Courts show, the young beautiful women—nay, children, for "suffer little children to come unto me" is no less the command of the capitalist ravishers than the capitalist Christ, and their victims often are dead and buried before they can be called women—of the working class are at the disposal of the "rich friend"—private monopoly, not nationalisation! Note the difference.

No, working class revolution has never yet failed to effect a moral cleansing. When the Commune of Paris was in being the prostitutes of Paris flocked to Versailles, to their bourgeois patrons. In Paris no woman had to sell herself for food under the Commune. Prostitution is a pillar of capitalism, a common foundation of starvation wages. That this feature of the system of private property should assume a "nationalised" form along with the "nationalisation" of all the other means by which they are enabled to plunder the workers easily enough suggests itself to the filthy minds of the capitalists, and it goes without saying that there will be some mugs in the workers' ranks ready to swallow the noxious concoction. J.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

## EVERY POINT BUT THE ONE AT ISSUE.

TO THE EDITOR.

Dear Sir,—May I, as one who disagrees with your remarks in this month's SOCIALIST STANDARD with reference to the Socialist Labour Party and the fight for their Press, be permitted to say a few words on the subject?

You give as the reason for the Government being able to force strikers to accept their terms the fact that they, the Government, control the "armed forces of the nation." This is certainly true, but it is important to remember that the "armed forces of the nation" are composed of workers who do not understand the fight that is being waged against their own class, so as to enable the masters to obtain a maximum return for a minimum expenditure. For one can hardly conceive class-conscious workers obeying the commands of the Government to shoot down their fellow-men who had come out on strike. So we find that the power of the Government rests upon the ignorance of the workers, and not upon the "armed forces of the nation" at their command. For it must be clear to all that once the workers realise their position, the "armed forces of the nation" cease to exist. Even the Government have realised this, and attempt to prevent the workers from obtaining the truth, by suppressing such papers and pamphlets from which they would be likely to obtain it.

Therefore it appears to me that what we have to do is not to work for the capture or control of the "armed forces," but to educate the workers, and to do this one must at least have a free Press. It is because the Socialist Labour Party realise this that they are fighting so hard to recover their Press.

My friends and I would be much obliged if the Editor would allow the above to appear in next month's "Standard."—Yours, G. MANNE.

It is evident from the first sentence of his letter that our correspondent has failed to grasp the claim of the S.L.P.

Clearly it was not the fight for the S.L.P. Press that was in dispute, but their claim that this fight was one for "the Principle of a Free Press." Here is the quotation from their own letter published in the November "S.S.":

Quite apart from the fact that we are at a great disadvantage and suffering considerable loss, . . . the Principle of a Free Press is at stake.

We showed quite conclusively that no such principle existed, or could exist under capitalism, therefore it could not be "at stake." This was the essential point of our criticism, and as our correspondent carefully avoids this point, his letter calls for no further comment.

ED. COM.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY  
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

## OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

## HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 175 Vol. 15.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## SOME PARS FROM AMERICA

NOT READ AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

As news of the American labour movement is so scarce in these days of censorship and Press laws, perhaps the following notes from the December issue of the New York "Class Struggle," an unofficial organ of the so-called left wing of the also so-called Socialist Party of America may be of interest to the reader.

In a candid article on the recent elections it is admitted that the large vote received by the S.P. of A. at the 1917 election was more of an anti-war vote than one for Socialist principles and that this vote has now gone back to the "old parties." By this means the recent "slump" is accounted for.

Nothing seems to be left of the sprinkling of Socialist legislators that were elected in the previous year in Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and California. Kansas, Idaho, Illinois, and Minnesota are again without Socialist representatives in the legislatures, and Minneapolis lost its Mayor, Van Lear, which is hardly to be regretted. This precious "Socialist" who, at the beginning of the war had opposed the "infamous Public Safety Commission" as the new election approached "compromised himself and the party that elected him, by joining hands with the American Alliance of Labour and Democracy, and by speaking from its platform at a so-called Victory Meeting. . . . That Van Lear took this stand not so much from a change of conviction as from openly opportunist motives, above all get to re-elected, by no means detracts from this sorry spectacle.

The article declares that the defeat of Meyer London, the late "Socialist" Congressman for New York, is "one thing to be thankful for." After telling the tale of his re-actionary, pro-capitalist activity in Congress during the war the writer concludes: "His re-nomination is not to the credit of the membership of New York, even though it was prompted by the consideration that the district would be lost if another candidate were nominated in his place."

Such are the methods of the anti-revolutionary, anti-Socialist ideas which permeate the membership of the S.P. of A. Is this the party which is

going to overthrow the best entrenched and most unscrupulous capitalist oligarchy in the world? I think not.

Very little news has reached this country about one of the most dastardly outrages among the many which American capital has perpetrated upon its wage-slaves. The sequel, too, is interesting. In Bisbee in Arizona, in 1917,

"four thousand miners went on strike against the Phelps Dodge Mining Corporation for a ten per cent. wage increase and a reduction of the ten-hour workday to nine hours. . . . At that particular time there was an enormous demand for metal ore, and the highest prices were being paid. The Company saw fat profits slipping away between their fingers; the strike was costing them millions of dollars. They were, therefore, prepared to come to terms on the question of wages, and would perhaps have granted a reduction of working hours. But they refused point blank to consider the recognition of the union demanded by the striking miners.

Then on the 17th June the bosses took action:

A great crowd of striking miners that had gathered about the entrance to one of the mines was surrounded by an army of police, deputy sheriffs, and gun-men, were driven, unarmed as they were, before the loaded guns of their captors, to the railroad station. There, all of them, men, women and children, were forced with unbelievable brutality into a waiting freight train, in which they were shipped across the border into New Mexico, about seven hundred miles from Bisbee, where they were thrown out of the cars in the midst of an uninhabited desert. In this deserted region of New Mexico, completely cut off from all communication with their families and the world, these unfortunate men, women and children were exposed to the most intense suffering. And only the foodstuffs that were brought them by organised labour at the earliest possible moment saved these thousands of workers from a miserable death.

It took some time before the energetic protests of labour in the West were finally able to force an investigation. It was disclosed that this dastardly crime had been committed not only with the knowledge, but with the assistance of the management of the mines and the local authorities of Bisbee. The corporation officials had paid the gun-men, while the local authorities had engaged the



scoundrels who did this dirty work. Indictments followed, indictments that incriminated the highest officials among the millionaire knaves at the head of the company. Proudly the capitalist press showed that there was no class justice in the United States of America, that rich and poor were measured by the same standards, that not even the richest of the men responsible for the Bisbee outrage would be able to escape the hand of justice.

That was six months ago. Since then things have been strangely quiet. And now comes the news that the entire matter has been dropped because of a technical error in the indictment. (Italics mine.)

\* \*

A very interesting account of the recent food riots in Japan is given by the well-known Sen Katayama. The immediate cause of the riots was the high price of rice, the staple food of the Japanese workers. Dr. Yokoi, "the agricultural authority of Japan, says in 'Industrial Japan': 'The past five years have produced super-abundant rice crops in Japan. Statistics show that there is no shortage of rice this year.' The article following the Japanese 'Oriental Economist,' declares that the high prices were directly due to the policy of the Government in aiding and encouraging export trade. The political machinery of the country functions exclusively in the interests of a few big capitalists, while the interests of the vast majority of the people and the workers are completely disregarded."

The various phases of the riots are described in some detail. They "usually began in a peaceful demonstration that went to the homes of the rice dealers or to the granaries to demand cheaper food. Invariably it was the police who met the demonstrators with drawn sabres that turned these for the most part peaceful demonstrations in furious attacks." The riots were very wide-spread, extending "over three prefectures, Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto, over thirty provinces, and in Hokkaido, the northern part of Japan. Altogether this rising affected over two-thirds of the Japanese Empire. The 'Oriental Economist' reports that there were destructive riots in 142 different localities; that in 38 places they could be put down only by armed troops. In Osaka (the Manchester of Japan) the rioting continued for three full days and nights, and it is roughly estimated that at its height a force of over thirty thousand soldiers, including cavalry, was necessary to control the infuriated masses."

"In Kure, where the chief Navy Yard of the Empire is located, the marines were called out in full strength to quell the desperate mobs, while all thoroughfares and important crossings were armed with machine guns. But in spite of the rigid military discipline that obtains in the Japanese army, it was found that a number of the marines had made common cause with the rioting masses. . . . In Kobe the populace burnt down stores, offices, and even the residences of the wealthy rice speculators. The rioters were joined in a sympathetic

movement of the 8,000 workers in the Mitsubishi shipbuilding yards." It must be remembered that working-class organisations, which might have rendered the movements more effective and less chaotic and violent, are illegal in Japan.

After August 13th the Government, fearing the spread of the disturbances, suppressed all news relating to the riots. "In Osaka the Governor published an edict forbidding more than five persons walking together on the streets. In Yokohama street assemblies were limited to nine persons."

"When the Government saw the magnitude of the movement, it appropriated \$5,000,000 with which rice was bought up to be given away to the poor, or to be sold at greatly reduced rates to stem the tide of popular dissatisfaction." This, however, failed to have the desired result, for the movement had developed new characteristics. "Since the food riots have ceased there have been labour troubles all over the country. The 'Oriental Economist' gives a detailed account of seven large strikes that occurred between the 1st and the 19th of August, while the daily newspapers enumerate at least 40 others." The legal machinery, of course, reaped a rich harvest. "According to the latest reports (Sept. 12), over 5,000 persons were arrested and are awaiting trial. It is estimated by the Government that the number of arrests will reach more than 7,000 before the whole matter is settled. Among them are numerous Socialists. Chief among these is Yei Osugi, arrested at Osaka. The Government is particularly desirous of incriminating our comrades as mob leaders."

The article further hints that a contributory cause of the riots was the discontent of the workers with the Government's policy of intervention in Siberia. Whether this is so or not the political sequel to the disturbance was significant, for the Terauchi Government was superseded and the new ministry under Premier Hara reversed the policy of the old ministry in Russian affairs, and openly declares that Japan desires only a responsible government in Russia, whether it be Bolshevik or not." Of course, this eyewash may satisfy for a time the workers of Japan, but we know that a working-class government can in no circumstances be considered "responsible" by the bourgeoisie.

R. W. H.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

A WAGE SLAVE. -Too late for this month, but we will wipe your eye for you in our next.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 28, Union Street, W.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

## LABOUR UNREST.

The most striking feature of the wave of unrest sweeping the working class to-day is the chaotic, and even contradictory, character of the claims put forward. The Clyde engineers struck—"unofficially," it is true—for a 40-hour week; the Belfast workers for 44 hours. The Engineering and Shipbuilding trades in general having accepted a 47 hour week with the following as a condition:

The unions will take all possible steps to ensure that in the critical state through which the country has to pass the greatest possible output will be secured and maintained.

were surprised to find the employers at once endeavouring to obtain as large, or even larger, an output in the 47 hours as under the 54, by speeding up, and cutting time for refreshment and so on.

Meanwhile the railway men had obtained recognition of the "principle" of the 8 hour day. Then the motor men on the London Tubes suddenly found that the half hour for meals allowed under the previous system was knocked off. Failing to get satisfaction through their officials they struck. Then ensued one of those situations that on the theatre stage would have caused roars of laughter, but which in real life is almost tragic. The main body of railway workers (apart from clerks, etc.) are grouped in two unions—the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, and the National Union of Railwaymen. As usual where two unions recruit from one body of workers, considerable jealousy exists between the officials. At first both unions refused to recognise the motor-men's strike. Then, seeing a chance to score off the N.U.R., the A.S.L.E.F. declared the strike "legal." Following this they signed an agreement with the Railway Executive that left the situation practically as it was before the strike. Now the officials of the N.U.R. saw their chance. They repudiated this agreement and declared their men as "officially" on strike. In the course of a few days this farcical situation was ended by the N.U.R. officials signing an agreement similar in all respects to that signed by their rivals, except that this empty phrase was added:

The companies are to offer reasonable facilities to meet the ordinary physical needs of the men.

The Shipbuilders and Repairers of the Thames are on strike for a 15s increase, while the Miners are balloting as to whether they shall strike to enforce their claims of a 6 hour day, 30 per cent. on wages, and nationalisation of the mines.

It is a favourite dodge of capitalist hacks to lay the cause of these actions of the workers on "Bolshevik agitators." But one simple fact puts this nonsense out of court. If the unrest were due to any organised agitation, clearly it would have one object or set of objects and follow a co-ordinated

policy to obtain them. It is true that a few Anarchist agitators, some of whom call themselves Bolsheviks, are taking advantage of the struggles to shout themselves into a brief notoriety, but they are no more the cause of the trouble than a cork bobbing in a stream is the cause of the water's flow. A couple of incidents proved completely how small was the influence of these people.

The Government decided to break the strike on the Clyde. Well informed as to internal matters of the men's organisation, they determined to deprive the strikers of their leaders, believing that this would collapse the strike.

A deputation had been appointed to interview the Mayor of Glasgow to try to persuade him to use his influence to obtain the intervention of the Government. A mass meeting of the strikers was to be held outside the Town Hall to hear the result. Instead of following the procedure usual when peaceful demonstrations are taking place of ordering vehicular traffic to suit its movements to the demonstration, the police first allowed a motor car to drive into the crowd, injuring two persons, and then tried to force some trams through the meeting. Upon protest being made against this the police charged the crowd with batons. The men's leaders rushed out and two of them were struck down by the police. After being taken inside the Town Hall and having their wounds dressed, they were allowed to speak to the meeting, and told the men to peaceably disperse and avoid all rioting. These leaders were then locked up and charged with inciting to riot!

Such a farcical charge exposes the police plot in its entirety. But this was not enough. Pretending that they feared an extension of the "riots," the Government cynically sent Scots soldiers, provided with machine guns, bombs, and wire netting, and later some Tanks, to protect the property of the master class. The plot succeeded and the strike collapsed.

Meanwhile a meeting of Electrical Workers in London decided to cease work and cut off all electrical power there to force the Government to introduce a 40 hour week throughout the country. The Government replied by issuing a new regulation under D.O.R.A. making it an offence to leave work on any electrical power plant supplying electricity to public and other services. The Electricians took the hint and nothing occurred.

These collapses show how small was the influence of these "agitators." Still more clearly they show the overwhelming importance of the control of political power.

A calm examination of the situation will reveal that the main factors behind the great unrest are, the high cost of living and, of greater importance, the dread of increase in the large amount of unemployment already existing with the further demo-

Continued on p. 63







soldier was called in and was offered 30s. a week if he would take an interest and give all his time to the business, but the terms were refused.

The quotation given below appeared in the International Notes of the "Labour Leader," and emanates from Italy.

When will Socialists learn that capitalism is by instinct predatory, that no true League of Peoples is therefore possible, except under Socialism, that Socialism will only be established by Socialists, and that Socialists must place the whole of their faith and reliance in themselves, and not in any capitalist or despot, however benevolent.

The above would have read better and been more precise had it appeared thus: "When will the pseudo-Socialist," etc. However, I commend it to the Thornes, Lansburys, and others of that ilk who delight in labelling themselves Socialist, but spend their time bolstering up capitalism.

That inveterate gas-bag, Windy Churchill, is finding some of his chickens coming home to roost. There was a time when he blustered about digging the German Fleet "out like rats." But the British Fleet, for the maintenance of the efficiency of which Winly had been responsible previous to the war—at a good many thousands a year—had its chance, and Admiral Jellicoe has been compelled to issue a "defence" showing why he did not seize his opportunity. The Admiral compares the instrument which had been provided him by the windy braggart with that of the despised German, and the result must make many worshipper of the hero of Sidney Street wonder what he, as First Lord of the Admiralty, took his thousands for. The Admiral says that the British ships were out-classed in search-light power, inferior in range-finders, insufficiently provided with destroyers, not so well protected against dropping fire, and so on. In short, the egregious failure of the war had proved such a failure preparing for war that the British Admiral dared not close with his enemy.

Yet this guy, who went on from blunder to blunder, from Antwerp to Gallipoli, till even his thick hide could not save him from the public's jeers, and who, in order to rehabilitate himself, had finally to resort to that magnificent piece of bluff—the melodramatic reminder to the military authority that "my regiment is in France"—this fellow who had to fly to the funk-hole for shelter from the derision brought down upon his head by his own clumsy incapacity, is one of the chosen few who alone can "carry the country through the difficult times ahead." "There is something rotten in the State of"—capitalism when such empty-headed noodles are the best the country can find to run the show. The "directive ability" superstition which our masters are so fond of talking about gets a nasty one on the snout here.

THE SCOUT.

## AN ODISIOUS COMPARISON.

### A CAPITALIST ORGY OF MURDER.

At a time when a flood of slobber is being poured out through the capitalist Press concerning the "red-terror" in Russia it might not be inopportune to reproduce a report of a characteristic incident of the suppression of the Paris Commune of 1871. It illustrates the capitalist method of securing order when their supremacy is threatened by the working class. It is to be remembered that these butcheries, of which the following was but a small example, took place, not in the course of fighting, but after the struggle had ceased—not, therefore, under the influence of the fear and anxiety as to the course of the battle, but in cold-blooded lust of revenge.

"The column of prisoners halted in the Avenue Uhrich and was drawn up four or five deep on the footway facing to the road. General the Marquis de Gallifet and his staff, who had preceded us there, dismounted, and commenced an inspection from the left of the line and near where I was. Walking down slowly, and eyeing the ranks as if at an inspection, the General stopped here and there, tapping a man on the shoulder or beckoning him out of the rear ranks. In most cases, without further parley, the individual thus selected was marched out into the centre of the road, where a small supplementary column was thus soon formed. . . . They evidently knew too well that their last hour had come, and it was fearfully interesting to see their different demeanours. One, already wounded, his shirt soaked with blood, sat down in the road and howled with anguish; . . . others wept in silence. . . . It was an awful thing to see one man thus picking out a batch of his fellow-creatures to be put to a violent death in a few minutes without further trial. . . . A few paces from where I stood a mounted officer pointed out to General Gallifet a man and a woman for some particular offence. The woman, rushing out of the ranks, threw herself on her knees and with outstretched arms implored mercy, and protested her innocence in passionate terms. The General waited for a pause, and then, with most impassive face and unmoved demeanour, said: 'Madame, I have visited every theatre in Paris; your acting will have no effect on me.' . . . I followed the General closely down the line, still a prisoner, but honoured with a special escort of two chasseurs-à cheval, and endeavoured to arrive at what guided him in his selections. The result of my observations was that it was not a good thing on that day to be noticeably taller, dirtier, cleaner, older, or uglier than one's neighbour. One individual in particular struck me as probably owing his speedy release from the ills of this world to his having a

broken nose on what might have been otherwise an ordinary face, and being unable from his height to conceal it. Over a hundred being thus chosen, a firing party was chosen, and the column resumed its marching, leaving them behind. In a few minutes afterwards a dropping fire in our rear commenced and continued for over a quarter of an hour. It was the execution of these summarily convicted wretches."—"The Daily News," June 8, 1871.

Here is another report, referring to another case, showing how capitalist butchers dealt with those working men and women of Paris who dared to challenge their supremacy.

"On the 26th of last May we formed part of the column of prisoners who had left the Boulevard Malesherbes at eight o'clock in the morning in the direction of Versailles. We stopped at the Chateau of La Muette, where General Gallifet, after having dismounted from his horse, passed into our ranks, and then making a choice, he pointed out eighty-three men and three women. They were taken away along the talus of the fortifications and shot before us. After this exploit the General said to us: 'My name is Gallifet. Your journals in Paris have sullied me enough. I take my revenge.'"

—The *Liberte*, Brussels, 26th May, 1871.

Here is a report of a third instance:

"Yesterday (Sunday, 28th), about one o'clock, General Gallifet appeared at the head of about 9,000 prisoners. . . . They were evidently prepared for the worst fate, and dragged listlessly along, as though it were not worth while to walk to Versailles to be shot. M. de Gallifet seemed to be of the same opinion, and a little beyond the Arc-de-Triomphe he halted the column, selected eighty-two, and had them shot there and then.

—"The Times," May 31st, 1871.

Did the capitalist Press rise up in horror and indignation at these ruthless butcheries of daily occurrence? Did the journalists and parsons and public men of the capitalist world heap invective and insult upon the heads of these capitalist murderers who were executing capitalist vengeance on the workers of Paris? Here is what one English newspaper (The "Naval and Military Gazette," of May 27th, 1871) said, referring, of course, to the Communards, not to their butchers: "We are deliberately of the opinion that hanging is too good a death for such villains to die, and if medical science could be advanced by operating on the living body of the malefactors who have crucified their country, we at least should find no fault with the experiment."

As to how far the slaughtered were guilty even of the crimes which served to excuse their massacre is shown by the remark of a French capitalist paper (*Opinion Nationale*, June 1st, 1871), under the fear that the unburied corpses would give rise to pestilence: "A serious examination of the ac-

cused is imperative. One would like to see only the really guilty die."

This wholesale and absolutely indiscriminate massacre went on for weeks, after which farcical trials provided victims for bourgeois bullets for eighteen months, and for imprisonment and transportation for six years.

And if the workers wish to know how the capitalists really viewed this butchery of over thirty-thousand workers, AFTER THEY HAD LAID DOWN THEIR ARMS, it can be judged from the fact that to the day of his death that English monarch Edward VII, always so careful of bourgeois "public" opinion, maintained the relations of intimate friendship with one of the chief assassins of the piece, the man who used to wait daily for the processions of prisoners, and levy his toll at the city gates because the Paris journals had sullied him—General Gallifet. Well might such a class of vampires palpitate with horror because the Bolsheviks are (they allege) treating their bourgeois opponents to a mild dose of their own physic. Their own hideous example is looming ominously before their affrighted eyes.

A. E. J.

### LABOUR UNREST.—Continued.

bilisation of soldiers and closing down of various Government departments. These are the great common causes manifesting themselves in the different and unco-ordinated efforts of the workers in various parts of the country. They are trying to fight, more or less blindly, some of the effects of a system, while solidly supporting that system as a whole. Even in its immediate details they fail to see the absurdity of the terms they accept. Thus a child could understand that if production is maintained at the old level when hours are reduced, not a single extra worker will be employed. Yet the Engineering trades accept the condition that "the greatest possible output will be secured and maintained," and thus do their best to prevent the absorption of such of the unemployed as might have found work under the reduction of hours.

To the other factors causing unemployment may be added the shortage of materials.

The problem thus becomes intensified, and the expedient of shortening hours, good as far as it goes, cannot do more than act as a temporary check, while private ownership of the means of life continues. Not until the working class own and control the means of production and distribution will they be able to adjust the hours of labour to the requirements of society and the number able to work. To do this they must first understand and accept the principles of Socialism, then set to work to establish it by organising to take control of political power for the purpose of wresting the means of life from the hands of the master class. Only then will the "unrest" disappear—through its cause being abolished.

J. F.



## SOME RECEIPTS.

Circumstances (which you may call bad business arrangements without being far out) have prevented the regular publication of our lists. This does not mean that the need for funds is any less urgent. Every effort should now be made to provide funds for the final struggle, which is revealing itself all over the world as never before.

### SIXTH LIST.

Previously acknowledged	£257	3	0
Battersea Branch (Donation)	5	0	0
Islington "	3	10	0
Wood Green "	2	0	0
N.W. London "	1	0	0
T. Fowler, Wood Green	3	0	0
A Few Rebels	1	13	4
D. Gerber	1	0	0
Sheet 270, H. S. Shroeder	4	8	0
" 203, Hackney Branch: Howe, 2s. 6d.; F. E., 1s. 6d.; T. Bates, 1s.; Mike Murphy, 1s.; G. Seech, 2s. 6d.; Priest, 1s. 6d.; W. Howard, 1s.	1	10	0
" 188, D. W. Godfrey, Tottenham	1	11	10
" 214, J. Sterba	12	6	
" 149, T. Hall, Manchester	1	4	0
" 151, F. B. Chesire	15	0	
" 150, W. Brown	11	0	
" 152, H. C. Atkins	10	3	
" 134, Cliburn, Tooting	1	2	6
" 49, Barnes	5	0	
" Pike	5	0	
" Wallis	3	0	
" 46 Packham	10	0	
" 141, J. Goodfellow, Central	12	6	
" 210, Cope, West Ham	1	1	0
" 74, Doyle	2	6	
" 185, Dryer	7	6	
" 218, Parker	7	6	
" Bunny and Fluker, Islington	10	0	
" 182, Wray, Wood Green	16	6	
" 264, Harris	13	6	
" 263, Garrard, Hackney	14	0	
Per Ted Morris, Southsea, 4s. 3d.; T. W., 2s. 3d.; F. Flower, 6d.; T. Williams, 6d.; W. C. Chaplin, 2s. 6d.; Mr. and Mrs. Mills, 5s.	15	0	
Per H. Cross, 1s.; H. Lott, 1s.; W. Wale, 1s.; H. Lister, 6d.	3	6	
Shearstoue, Nottingham	15	0	
G. C. G.	10	0	
Dwyer Dublin	8	6	
J. D. Webb, Walthamstow	10	0	
P. J. L.	5	0	
J. Higgs	5	0	
E. J. Rumsby, Loughton	3	0	
G. D. Fincham	2	6	
A. F. Matthews, Wanstead	3	0	
Harry Hall	2	0	
A. Crease	2	0	
S. W. Palmer, Wandsworth	2	6	
W. D., R.A.M.C., T.F., B.E.F.	2	6	
L. Blom, 1s.; D. Jobits, 1s.; F. H., Tottenham, 1s.; T. R., 1s.	4	0	
Total	£297	12	11

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 28 Union St., London & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156 High St., E.C.6.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 176. Vol. 15.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

## BY STRIKE OR BY BALLOT?

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION.

While at the moment of writing final decisions have not been reached in the disputes in the Mining, Railway, and Transport industry, important facts have been revealed from which the working class can draw lessons.

The capitalist Press and the trade union leaders concerned have agreed that a strike of the workers engaged in these industries would be "a disaster," "an extremely serious matter," etc. These "labour leaders" have openly done all they could to prevent the men striking, not on the ground that the masters could win if they decided to fight in earnest, but on the shadowy pretext of "injury to the community" or "danger to the industry." When the master class took millions of wage-workers from production and sent them to slaughter their fellow-workers, these leaders were silent as to the "injury to the community" inflicted.

To help the leaders swindle the rank and file a Commission of Inquiry into the coal industry was formed. As so often happens in these inquiries, some awkward facts about the coal owners leaked out. When introducing the Bill to set up this Commission Mr. Lloyd George made the entirely unsupported assertion that if the miner's demands were granted the price of coal would rise by 8s. to 10s. per ton. Now this is one of the hoary, but very useful, lies that the master class and its agents—the journalists, economists, labour leaders, and politicians—employ to mislead the workers. In this case Lloyd George at once started to contradict himself, as he drew a dark picture of the power of American competition in "our" European market.

But the American miner receives higher wages, reckoned in money terms, than the English miner. Yet American coal, according to Lloyd George, is cheaper!

Lloyd George's ignorance of the most elementary facts of economics will doubtless shield him from the necessity of attempting to explain the dilemma he has landed himself in.

One superficial answer, "Then why do the masters always resist a rise of wages if they are automatically made good by a rise in prices?" completely confounds the journalist and politician of the master class. For a full working out of the whole question the reader is referred to Marx's splendid pamphlet, "Value, Price and Profit." Here we will only take one or two points from that work.

How are prices determined in any ordinary market? Immediately by the relations of Supply and Demand, ultimately by the cost of Production. Now a moment's thought will show that a rise in miner's wages will make no difference in the demand for coal. But without an increase in demand there will be a great difficulty in raising prices. Thus it is evident the coal owners, in the first place, must pay the increased wages from their profits.

"But," it may be asked, "does not a rise in wages mean an increase in the cost of production?" Not necessarily. Cost of production is based upon the time taken, on the average, to produce a given quantity of any commodity. When the masters find themselves unable to raise prices after a rise in wages, they try to reduce the time taken to produce the particular commodity by (1) speeding up the workers, (2) cutting out little laxities, as lunch time, etc. If unable to apply these methods they try to improve their organisation, speed up transport, introduce new machinery, and so on. Sometimes these methods are so successful that the commodities are produced at a lower cost than before the rise in wages. In fact, generally speaking, the higher waged worker is the cheaper producer, as is shown by America in so many instances.

In general the masters charge the highest prices the market will bear, no matter how low the wages they pay, and pay the lowest wages the workers will accept, no matter how high prices may be.

One of the first facts brought out at the Coal Commission was that the profits of the coal owners



had risen three-fold despite the increase in wages. Taking the figures, profits had risen (after paying £9,000,000 a year in royalties) from £13,000,000 (1s. 1d. per ton) in 1913, to £39,000,000 (3s. 6½d. per ton) in 1918. The fact that the Government took part of this increased profit in the shape of taxes does not affect the point. What the capitalists do with their profits makes no difference to the workers who have been robbed to produce them.

The Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co., with a capital of £657,202, had disclosed profits (after deducting depreciation, income tax, excess profits duty and coal mines excess payments) of about £5,261,000 in fifteen years ending 1918. The Ocean Coal & Wilson's Ltd., capital £3,396,000, paid in eight years over £3,500,000 in cash dividends and distributed £1,000,000 in bonus shares after making the deductions given above.

Manvers (Yorks.) paid 195 per cent. in ten years ending 1918, on the actual capital and paid off £285,500 worth of debentures. The Sheepbridge Coal and Iron Co., in ten years to 1918, paid 144 per cent. upon their capital. In 1918 a 33½ per cent. scrip bonus was paid. The Fife Coal Co. paid over 300 per cent on actual capital in ten years to 1918. In 1909 one bonus ordinary and one bonus 5 per cent. preference share were given for every four shares held. In 1918 there was a reserve of £500,000 and a carry forward of £126,456. This company owns a large percentage of the miners' houses in Fife, of which 80 per cent. have only two rooms.

All the above statements were given in the "Daily Telegraph" of March 18th, 1919.

The Consett Iron and Steel Co. paid 242½ per cent. in the six years 1913-1918, and in 1914 distributed £250,000 in bonus shares. The Navigation Coal Co. has paid its capital back four times over.

These figures do not disclose the whole case. In nearly every published balance sheet the miners' wages and the directors' fees are lumped together in one item. More or less ornamental figure-heads, often carrying a title, draw large sums yearly for doing nothing more intellectual than attending a meeting now and again and voting as the chairman directs.

More important still is the fact that under the item "Depreciation" the capital used up each year is repaid. This means that if 10 per cent. is set aside each year for depreciation, at the end of ten years the whole of the original capital has been replaced in addition to the dividends that have been paid year by year.

These few facts show how absurd was the laboured attempt on the part of the masters to claim that to grant the miners' demands would "ruin the trade," if not the country.

It was when the Reports of the Commission were given to the Government that the great lesson for

the workers emerged. In announcing that the Government had accepted and would act upon the Report of the Chairman's section of the Commission and referring to the possibility of a strike, Mr. Bonar Law said:

If such a strike comes the Government—and no Government could do otherwise—will use all the resources of the State without the smallest hesitation.

If such a strike came the mine-owners, if they decided to fight it out, could win by simply pitting their immense resources of wealth, an indication of which is given by the figures above, against the few pounds the miners could gather together. On the economic field the masters are in a far stronger position than the workers and can beat them any time they decide to fight to a finish. Yet in this, as in so many other cases, they threaten to use the overwhelming power of the State for their purpose because it is so much more speedy and decisive.

But how comes it that they can use the State for this purpose? Because on 14th December, 1918, the miners, in conjunction with the large majority of the other workers, placed the State in the hands of the masters when they voted the latter into possession of political power.

While the workers accept the poisonous nonsense that "capital should have a fair profit," while they swallow the lies and humbug of the labour leaders like Thomas, Brace, Williams, and so on, that the interests of the master class are the interests of the "community" or "society," they will be easily led to vote their masters into possession of the power to rule society.

When the working class rids itself of this stupidity, and realises its weakness in the economic field against the power of the employers, then it will turn to the facts of its situation for a solution, and find that the way to salvation lies through organisation for control of the political powers. Not until that is assured can the workers own the means of life and operate them for their own benefit. When that lesson is learnt the day of Socialism will be dawning.

J. FITZGERALD.

#### CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Please note that the Head Office address is now:

17, MOUNT PLEASANT,  
LONDON, W.C. 1.,

where all communications should be sent.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

#### PAST CLASS STRUGGLES.

In the last article we gave an outline of the English Peasants' Revolt and its consequences. In the meantime conditions in Germany had brought about a similar revolt there.

The break-up of the Roman Empire left Germany cut up into feudal territories with a feudal lord over each. Then came the growth of commerce which developed the wealth and importance of the city burghers. The luxuries of the East were brought West and enjoyed by the townsmen into whose hands gradually centred all the handicraft, art and luxuries of the times. This placed the feudal lord at a disadvantage and aroused his envy. He, who looked down from the superior height of traditional regality upon the lowbred townsman, found himself the townsman's inferior in wealth and splendour. He consequently looked around for means to increase his wealth.

In those days the nobility lived in fortified castles and surrounded themselves with trained bands of retainers and soldiery. Their usual method of increasing the worldly possessions was by issuing from their castles on marauding expeditions, and lying in wait and robbing the travellers that passed through their territories. Wm. Jacobs, in his "History of the Precious Metals," writes of the internal conditions of Germany at this time as follows:—

Those countries under a rigid feudal system were divided into various independent and petty sovereignties, all jealous of their neighbours, and frequently embroiled with them. The roads and rivers were insecure, and the protection either to property or persons passing along them, dependent upon the interest, the caprice or the cupidity of the various princes or nobles who ruled the several minor dominions. . . . No protection was afforded to intercourse, and commerce was consequently almost unknown. (Vol. II., pp. 23-24.)

As time went on, however, lying in wait for travelling merchants became less profitable, more dangerous, and but a slow and doubtful way of acquiring the necessary wealth to obtain the delicious luxuries enjoyed by the rich merchants. Consequently the feudal princes and lords had to cast about for other methods of raising the money to purchase the good things of the new life. Right at their hands lay the weapon of conquest—the further exploitation of the peasantry.

Karl Marx, in "Capital," Vol. 1., p. 220, says of these peasants:

In the 15th Century the German peasant was nearly everywhere a man who, whilst subject to certain rents paid in produce and labour, was otherwise at least practically free. The German colonists in Brandenburg, Pomerania, and Silesia and Eastern Prussia, were even legally acknowledged as free men.

These peasants had not sunk to the same level of serfdom as the English peasants of this period, although the degradation was soon to be accomplished. They had stretches of common lands,

and under the system of *cervée* (statute labour) they owed a comparatively small amount of labour and produce to the lords.

With the growth of the lords' appetite for luxury, however, the oppression of the peasantry and the seizure of their common lands developed into a system of bare-faced robbery. Their rents were steadily converted into money rents and increased. Documents were forged whereby the rights of the peasants were curtailed and their duties increased.

From the end of the 15th Century there were sporadic revolts on the part of the peasantry, but these were easily crushed. Eventually (1525) there was a general and extensive rising of the peasantry throughout Southern Germany.

The German Peasants' War was, unfortunately for the peasants, a disunited and badly organised affair. In spite of the fact that the rising was general throughout Germany, each territory fought out its own individual battles, and, although there were numerous peasant armies in the field, instead of forming a united plan of action, they all aspired to be self-sufficient and acted locally only. Not so the nobles. They formed a league (the Swabian League) to raise and equip an army for the purpose of putting down the rising everywhere. While they momentarily concluded peace with one army they fell upon and destroyed another. And in this manner, by bribery, chicanery, fraud, and force, they destroyed the peasant forces piecemeal.

Each group of peasants formulated their demands in the shape of a number of articles, but eventually the twelve articles adopted by the Swabian peasantry became generally accepted as the basis of the movement. The principal demands in these articles were

1. Right of Electing their own Ministers.
2. Reduction of Tithes.
3. Abolition of Villeinage.
4. Liberty to Fish and Kill Wild Game.
5. Restoration of Woods.
10. Restoration of Common Lands.
11. Abolition of Death Dues.

Here, as in England, the lords pursued their time-dishonoured methods of dodgery, promising redress until the simple peasants had been put off their guard, and then falling upon and slaughtering them unmercifully.

Throughout the war the peasants were remarkable for their forbearance, and the lords for their ferocity. In spite of extreme provocation only two cases of alleged barbarity could be quoted against the peasantry. In one case a Baron von Helfenstein, who had achieved notoriety by his cruelty, and who had massacred peasants by the dozen in cold blood, was captured at the town of Weinsberg. The leaders of the United Contingent (the peasant army that captured the place) gave orders that he was to be kept prisoner, but a section of the pea-

(Continued on next page.)



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant Lond., W.C. 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " "	9d.

## The Socialist Standard,

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1919.

## WHAT WE WANT.

A lot of make-believe capitalist sympathy has been slobbered over the working class recently as the result of the revelations of some of the horrors of working-class existence in the mining districts and in the East End of London. That the capitalists may make a genuine effort to improve these conditions is quite possible. The war has shown them that they have a C 3 nation of workers, and the latest births and deaths returns have revealed to them the unpleasant prospect that unless they bestir themselves they will soon have no nation of workers at all on which to found the military and commercial supremacy of their Empire. But even if they do improve the workers conditions; if they stable them in palaces and harness them in "Workmen's Charters"; if Lord Leverem finds that he can exhaust his men in six hours and does it, and Mr. Ford discovers anew that high wages, as the Dutch say of paint, cost nothing—what then?

Such things, realised far beyond the realms of possibility, would leave us unmoved. We are out for LIFE for the workers. The world is beautiful. Life is glorious. Even work is joy if a man may, as Morris said, "rejoice in the work of his hand." Evolution has given us the possibility of producing by work, as distinct from toil, wealth in such abundance that the amenities of civilisation shall be the portion of all, without stint.

A place in the sun, a draught of the sweet air of the meadow, the tranquillity of the country sunset, relieved of the shadow of our slavery—are they not worth fighting for? Are the workers for ever to be content with the mentality that can raise a singer to fame and fortune on such a song as "Champaign Charley"? The earth sings a better song after rain, but how many of us have heard it? The World with all its beauty is for the Workers if they will but take it.

## PAST CLASS STRUGGLES.—Continued.

santry (some of whom had suffered personally at his hands) had resolved upon his death, and he was executed. This act was used as an excuse for the atrocities that followed.

The United Contingent, making the same mistake as the modern workers, appointed as commander a dissatisfied hanger-on of the ruling class, a knight Gotz von Berlichingen, and after his appointment the articles originally formulated were gradually watered down. Like the modern labour leader, he played the game of the ruling class, and his vacillating and treacherous policy largely conduced to the early defeat of the peasants in the quarter where he commanded.

Eventually the lords succeeded, with the aid of mercenary soldiery and a quantity of artillery, in crushing the peasantry. Then the wholesale execution of men, women, and children became the order of the day.

The majority of the leaders of the insurrection were captured, tortured, and wasted to death, or died in prison. It is estimated that not less than 130,000 peasants were slaughtered during and immediately after the revolt. "At least 100,000 were killed," says the ultra-conservative "Harmsworth Encyclopædia," p. 4623.

It is worth noting that Martin Luther, the apostle of revolt (for early capitalism) against Roman Catholicism, opposed the peasants' rising with all his power, and suggested that the best way to deal with the insurrection was to exterminate the peasantry! He is reported to have written the following sublime exhortation: "Crush them, strangle them, and pierce them, in secret places and in sight of men, he who can even as one would strike dead a mad dog." ("Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th edition, article "Luther.")

The German Peasants' War, like the English Peasants' Revolt, was but a reactionary movement, an incident and an accompaniment of the gradual rise to a share in political control of the wealthy burghers of the towns.

The crushing of the peasantry in the war fixed the bonds of servitude still more securely upon their backs, and degraded them to the lowest depths of villeinage. Many decades elapsed ere they could rise from their prostrate position, and then it was only to be precipitated into a still worse servitude—the servitude of the wage slave.

In the evolution of society only movements that are logical sequences of social development can succeed. The writer recommends this point to the consideration of the Anarchist Communist, who mournfully moans for the return to peasant-proprietorship or small ownership, disregarding economic development and the results of the scientific examination of society. The conclusions of the Socialist are correct and safe because they are based on, and harmonise with, the normal development of society.

GILMAC.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## A "BOLSHIE" CRITIC.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—In this month's SOCIALIST STANDARD I read an unsigned article entitled "Where we Stand." I take it for granted that it is the object of the writer to outline the S.P.G.B. position in relation to "Bolshevism" and kindred subjects.

Perhaps you will also permit a little criticism from an ignorant wage slave, one, at least, upon whose shoulders the mantle of the Pope has not fallen.

This article is apparently intended to impress upon its readers that the Bolshevik Government in Russia is not in any way Socialist, in consequence if that is where WE are to stand I maintain that WE shall be anything but Socialists. In the words of the S.P.G.B. Declaration of Principles,

Socialism is the establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

That is Socialism, and that is what the Bolsheviks are now doing. It is obvious to all reasonable men that it cannot all be done at once, especially considering the horrible mess Czarism and Kerenskyism left Russia in.

Therefore I maintain that Bolshevism is Socialism in embryo, and in truth Bolsheviks are Socialists in practice.

Our friend says: "On what do the Bolshevik leaders depend for their strength? Certainly not on a class-conscious working class." Perhaps in next month's "S.S." he will explain how it is that the workers of Russia overthrew the Czarist and then the Kerensky Government if they were not class-conscious. They must have distinctly realised the difference between Czarist Feudalism, Kerensky Capitalism, and Bolshevik Socialism. In order to achieve this they must be class-conscious. There is no necessity for one to read the whole mountain of Socialist literature in order to become class-conscious. The idea is quite easy of understanding, and the Russian peasant, although illiterate, probably thinks more clearly than the alcohol-drenched, narcotic-poisoned, syphilitic, football-playing, novel-reading, mis-educated mob of OUR civilisation. The peasant living in his village commune knows the value of self-help and mutual aid. He knows also his miseries are due to the class above him. His tutors have been of the class war, bitter experience, the knout, the Cossack, and the bayonet. He is class-conscious in the real sense of the word; that is why he flung out Kerensky & Co.

Our writer goes on to tell us "the peasant cannot understand Socialism." I have discovered the only thing necessary to overcome in the teaching of Socialism is prejudice. It is unnecessary for the peasant to read vols. I, II, III. of "Capital," but merely to realise, as he undoubtedly does, that the reason why his lot is so deplorable, or was, is because his home, his tools, his life, his labour and the land on which he works is owned and controlled by a robber baron who grinds him down for the product of his labour power. He knows also the only way to achieve salvation is by means of the Social Revolution and the establishment of that system advocated, taught and fought for by Lenin known as Socialism.

The Russian peasant understands not the theories of philosophy, economics, and science, but he has tasted the fruit of Socialism, and in consequence is a Socialist. Our friend further says: "How is it likely that they" (the peasants) "can conceive any advantage arising from

common ownership of the land?" Isn't it perfectly obvious to all that the peasant must immediately see the advantages accruing from the social ownership of land? He who has been enslaved in serfdom from time immemorial by the despotism of a land-owning gang of arch-dukes under Czarism, cannot see the advantages accruing to his own freedom of organisation and control through the Soviet. Our friend's ideas of the establishment of Socialism are also very curious. He seems to imagine Socialism will spring up in a night all the world over like the proverbial mushroom.

I presume Socialism will grow and spread, experience victories and suffer defeats like all other social growths, and at last become a world owned by workers. The Russian Socialist Commonwealth is the first great blow but even now it is extending; in every country Bolshevism is showing its head. On p. 54 our friend sneers at the idea of Industrial organisation, but I would point out that in the Socialist Commonwealth we must have the workers' committees in every workshop; it is the only way for the workers to democratically control their work. We want political and industrial control. If the writer wishes to maintain the parliamentary system of perennial cackle about nothing in particular, he is not a Socialist. As a closing word I protest against the mean, belittling attitude to the Bolsheviks maintained by some members of the S.P.G.B.

At the present moment Bolshevism is the grandest movement of history in progress before our eyes, a proletarian revolution. The expropriators have been expropriated; the workers of Russia have united and broken their chains. When the Russians read of this Pecksniffian criticism, not a word of praise or appreciation, they will say, are there any Socialists in the S.P.G.B.? Let this Philistine remember those who are real Socialists, those who have sacrificed all for the Cause and some who have died for it—Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxembourg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin, and last but not least, Lenin and Trotsky.—Yours, "A WAGE SLAVE."

Like most of the Bolshevik supporters in this country, our correspondent reveals himself a genius for loose thinking, translating itself into random utterance. Take, for example, one of his earliest assertions: "In the words of the S.P.G.B. Declaration of Principles, 'Socialism is the establishment of a system of Society,'" and so on. A person who can imagine that our Declaration of Principles contains any such statement may well say that the mantle of the Pope has not fallen on his shoulders. The "Pope's mantle" has graced the shoulders of many a rogue, but never a fool. The establishment of a system of society, no matter on what basis, is not Socialism. It is an act—Socialism is not an act, it is a system of society.

One who is ready to write so loosely, and with such small regard for the truth, finds it easy enough to show that Socialism has been established in Russia. He simply declares it for a start, and then embarks on a course of fiction to "lend an air of verisimilitude to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative." So it is "unnecessary for the peasant to read . . . 'Capital,' but merely to realise, as he undoubtedly does, that the reason why his lot is so deplorable, or was, is because his home, his tools, his life, his labour, and the land on which he he works is owned and controlled by a robber



baron . . . and "He who has been enslaved in serfdom from time immemorial," and so on.

Now that might pass as fiction of the kind which is not "founded on fact." But in real life "He who has been enslaved in serfdom from time immemorial" was emancipated from serfdom over 50 years ago in the first place; his "home, tools, labour and the land on which he works" are not "owned and controlled by a robber baron" in the third place, and even if the peasant were still living under feudalism his home and the rest of it would not be owned and controlled by a robber baron, for such conditions belong, not to feudalism, but to chattel-slavery. Might not the facts as here outlined make some difference in what it is necessary for the peasant "merely to realise"?

Of course, one who cannot see the difference between a peasant and a serf; one who fails to understand that the conditions of feudalism are not those of chattel-slavery, is hardly likely to appreciate the point that a social order is a system, in which every part stands as cause and effect to the other parts. Hence his difficulty.

Our correspondent, rising to olympic heights of irony, suggests that we should, by way of supporting our contention that the Bolsheviks do not depend on a class-conscious working class for their strength, explain how it is that the "workers" of Russia overthrew the Czarist and then the capitalist Kerensky Government if they were not class-conscious. The answer to that is that they did nothing of the sort. If our critic has any proof, nay, even any evidence, that what he suggests is correct, we challenge him to produce it. As a matter of fact it is admitted by the staunchest friends of the Bolshevik movement that the election for the Constituent Assembly (an election based upon a popular franchise) resulted in a bourgeois majority. So far is it from being true, therefore, that the working class overthrew the Kerensky crowd, that the working class voted the bourgeoisie into power, and the Bolsheviks it was who squashed the Kerensky crowd by suppressing the Constituent Assembly.

"Isn't it perfectly obvious to all that the peasant must immediately see the advantages accruing from the social ownership of land?" asks our critic. Well, in the first place there is no evidence to show that the Bolsheviks have attempted to place the land on a basis of social ownership. The reports of those most favourable to the insurrection even, fall short of this, and claim that each peasant may own as much land as he can till without hired assistance. That is not social ownership, but the very reverse. Socialisation of the land would take away from the peasants the land which they previously owned, and seemingly it was so "perfectly obvious" to the Bolsheviks that such a proposal would not commend itself to the peasants that they dared not attempt to proceed to it. When

the Russian serfs were "emancipated" and became peasants the trouble was that, in order to compel them still to work for the nobles, they were given insufficient land to support them. Enormous taxation was superimposed on this. The natural view-point of the peasant is therefore quite clear. His aspirations would be, not in the direction of giving up his little land to society, but of getting more land—an economic holding. In those districts where the mir still exists, and the land is the property of the commune, the opposition would for obvious reasons be even stronger.

There are other points we should like to have dealt with, and had not our correspondent abused our space with a lot of sentimental twaddle we should have had room to answer more fully the wild and unsupported statements he has treated us to. But for the present our space is quite exhausted. Ed. Com.

### BY THE WAY.

O.O.

The Church has been used for many and varied purposes since the time when the Christ of the Gospels was supposed to have turned the money-changers out of the Temple. The observation which, according to the narrator, he then made, namely, that his father's house, which was a house of prayer, had been converted into a den of thieves, would apply with equal force to-day. However, the latest 20th century use to which the Church has been put is to convert it into a kind of picture palace so that well-fed and well-groomed bourgeois women can see on the sheet how their poorer sisters live, move, and have their being in that "station of life in which it has pleased God to place them." Beautiful phrase, this! I've heard many an oily-tongued parson work it off with due solemnity. But let me return to the announcement:

Fashionably-dressed women crowded into St. Martin-in-the-Fields Church yesterday to see the production of a film depicting the lives of the poorer women of the East End.

It was much more pleasant to glean the desired information this way than going through dismal alleys and squalid courts to see these things as they really are. My lady might peradventure soil her gown, or in some other way become contaminated.

The Mayor of Bethnal Green said that in one locality he had visited a soldier's wife lived with her four children in one room. Standing in the room, he could touch the ceiling with one hand and reach the wall on either side without moving. It was quite easy to push a stick through the wall and make a hole through which the street could be seen.—"Daily News," Feb. 24th, 1919.

Whether, as a result of this entertainment, the above-mentioned soldier's wife and her four children (which are a "priceless national asset") have been invited to come over West and live sumptuously is not recorded. But doubtless the "fashionably-

dressed women" are cheered on life's rough way by the thought of the hymn which says:

The rich man in his castle,  
The poor man at his gate;  
God made, them high or lowly,  
And ordered their estate.

Since the above remarks were written another wonderful discovery has been made. Owing to the publicity given to the gathering at St. Martin-in-the-fields Church the Queen summoned the Mayor of Bethnal Green to the Palace that she might hear more about slumdom. And lo and behold one morning on perusing the daily paper we read:

It is pretty clear to me that when I have visited the poorer districts I have been taken mainly to the highways and not to the by-ways.—The Queen, "Daily Sketch," March 15th, 1919.

Now it would appear that those who are responsible for organising the joy-rides which royalty partake of have been guilty of perpetrating a cruel hoax. At long last the truth is out. In this fair land of England there are sunless homes.

Describing one set of properties, Col. Lewis said they were what was known as "back-to-back" houses. This he illustrated by two boxes, and explained that only one side was open to the outer air, and that was the front of each cottage.

As the whole of the sanitary arrangements were located close to the front door, her Majesty could imagine what the conditions of life must be.

"Horrible!" was the Queen's comment.

The Mayor further stated that some of the properties were never reached by the rays of the sun during any part of the day. (Same paper.)

One would imagine from the prominence given to this subject that slumland was a characteristic only of the East End instead of being one of the main features of capitalist society. The workers are herded where the idle master class would scorn to keep their cattle.

But fortunately the dawn appears to be breaking, and at last the workers show signs of studying their class position and the cause of their enslavement—the class ownership of the means of life. When they fully grasp this they will join with us in the Socialist Party, realising that the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself.

We have on more than one occasion in the past drawn attention to the fact that in spite of the label "Liberal" or "Tory" which the adherents of these political parties attach to themselves they are at bottom supporters of capitalism. Consequently when they think that their interests as such are threatened they drop their labels for the time being in order to present a united front to the impending menace. Never was this more clearly shown than in the recent London County Council Elections. In the North Paddington District the mere nomination of a couple of Labour candidates was sufficient to "put the wind up 'em." The municipie

reform candidates enclosed with their election address the following note:

LONDON COUNCIL ELECTION, 1919.  
IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ELECTORS.

The Progressive Party are NOT opposing our re-election—but at the last moment the Labour Party have nominated two Candidates, therefore we trust Electors will not fail to record their votes.

To those who have carefully studied Labour's Programme for London, which, after all, is not very revolutionary, this attack of nerves of the reformers may cause some amusement.

There recently appeared in "Reynolds's Newspaper" (23.2.1919) an alleged copy of an official document published in the "Anarchiste de Briansk," as follows:

The Workmen's Soviet of Mourzilowka,  
September 16, 1918.

An order to Comrade Gregoire Savelieff. The Soviet hereby gives full power to Comrade Gregoire Savelieff to requisition at his choice and discretion for the needs of the Artillery Division stationed at Mourzilowka, district of Briansk, sixty women and girls of the bourgeois and speculator classes and bring 'hem to the barracks.

(Signed) President of the Soviet, SKAMEIKIUS.

Then the "Reynolds" scribe adds—"We print this document because it shows better than anything else what our women have to expect from any 'triumph of Bolshevik principles' in this country."

Unfortunately for the writer of those words, this document has appeared in slightly different form in other capitalist journals. On one occasion a reader of the "Times," who had spent two years in Russia (Sept. 1916 to Oct. 1918) wrote to that journal explaining the "nationalisation of women" proclamation, but failed to get his reply inserted. Such tactics show the value of these "reliable authorities" and "official documents."

We might ask our contemporary in passing what they have to say with regard to the "nationalisation" of the women and girls in the licensed houses in France. This canting hypocrisy maketh one sick!

Perhaps it would not be amiss at this juncture to again refer to the "Infamous Circular Memorandum" issued in 1886 by Lord Roberts, part of which read as follows:

In the regimental bazaars it is necessary to have a sufficient number of women, to take care that they are sufficiently attractive, to provide them with proper houses, and above all, to insist upon means of ablution being always available.

The story of how these "attractive women" were obtained is told in the work entitled "The Queen's daughters in India," published in 1898. One extract must suffice:

The orders specified were faithfully carried out, under the supervision of commanding officers, and were to this



effect. The commanding officer gave orders to his quartermaster to arrange with the regimental *Kutwal* (an under official, native) to take two policemen (without uniforms) and go into the villages and take from the homes of these poor people their daughters from fourteen years and upwards, about twelve or fifteen girls at a time. They were to select the best looking. Next morning these were all put in front of the Colonel and Quartermaster. The former made his selection of the number required. They were then presented a pass or license, and then made over to the old woman in charge of this house of vice under the Government. The women already there, who were examined by the doctor, and found diseased, had their passes taken away from them, and were then removed by the police out of the contonment, and these fresh, innocent girls put in their places.

After such well-authenticated evidence as to the "nationalisation" of women and girls in India by the British authorities one would have thought that even writers for the capitalist Press would have been more careful when engaged in mud-slinging lest some should recoil upon themselves

The following titbit, one of many, shows the supreme disinterestedness of the Allies, and proves conclusively that they only seek to make the world safe for themselves, no, beg parson, for democracy.

The question of the Italian-Jugo-Slav territory will not be easily settled.

Signor Orlando and Baron Sinno have been in communication with M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George, and will shortly also see Pres. Wilson on the matter to intimate that the Italians must possess Fiume, and that if the Conference refused this they will withdraw from its deliberations.—"Reynolds's," March 16th, 1919.

THE SCOUT.

## SOME RECEIPTS.

### SEVENTH LIST.

We have to acknowledge the following additions to our £1,000 Fund, with regrets that there are not more.

Previously acknowledged	£297 12 11
Sheet 211. Godfrey, Tottenham	3 0 0
" 179. Alley, Tooting	1 0 0
" 173. Hutchins "	5 0
" 58. Chexfield, Battersea	1 2 3
" 65. Jones, "	8 0
" 6. W. E. Brown, "	14 6
Battersea Branch Collection	1 16 9
Islington "	1 0 0
S. W. Todd, Central Branch	18 0
W. J. H., Fulham	2 6
A Few Rebels	1 18 10
Anon	1 3
Edmonton Branch	2 0 0
" 204. M Silverman, East London Br.	12 0
" 208. W. D., " "	5 0
Total	£312 17 0

### LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX AND ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 177. Vol. 15.]

LONDON, MAY, 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## THE POSITION.

THE OLD TALE RETOLD.

The major portion of the population of the earth have to put up with lives of slavery and the never-ending struggle against starvation, yet a life of ease and freedom is within their reach if they will stretch out their hands and grasp it.

Here are food, clothing, and shelter in abundance, and yet poverty, misery, and destitution are here in super-abundance. Here are people who spend their lives working or looking for work—these are members of the working class. Here are other who spend their lives in one long round of pleasure—these are the

### CAPITALIST CLASS.

Broadly speaking, the inhabitants of the civilised parts of the earth belong to one or other of these two classes.

All wealth that is produced, no matter what form it takes, is the result of the application of human labour power to nature-given material. This material and the finished product are owned by one group of the people—the international capitalists—those people whom we are told advance the money to carry on industry. The labour power is supplied by the miner, bricklayer, carpenter, manager, dustman, office boy, and other members of the working class. The brains and manual powers of the workers are utilised to produce articles that

### BELONG TO THE CAPITALISTS.

The statement that the capitalists, by advancing the money, have a right to the result, collapses as soon as the case is investigated. The particular function of the money as means of exchange has a tendency to confuse and cover the process of production with a mystical cloud. It is a matter of fact that it does not require money to dig for coal. It requires food, clothes, shelter, and the other things necessary to the maintenance of the miner while getting the

coal. The capitalists have the monopoly of the necessities of life, and they advance these necessities of life to the workers with a view of obtaining a profit. The fact that these necessities take the form of a sum of money in the first place is due to an

### HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

which lack of space prevents us describing in this article.

In these circumstances, therefore, the capitalists are the employing class and the workers the employed class. The interests of these two classes are directly opposite.

It is the interest of the employers to get work done as quickly and as cheaply as possible, for the cheaper the production the greater the profit—other things remaining equal.

But the interest of the workers as workers is the provision of work: the more work there is the fewer will there be in the unemployed army. Consequently it is to the interest of the workers to produce in as wasteful a manner as possible—digging holes and filling them up again is the ideal condition.

The energies of the employers are centred upon obtaining up-to-date machinery and instituting improved methods; but this means less work for the employees—a greater number of unemployed to fight for the jobs that are going.

Now why does this state of affairs exist? Why is work the all absorbing interest of the working class? It is because the workers

### DO NOT OWN THE PRODUCT

of their labour power. Yet all wealth is produced by the working class—even the very gold and paper that function as money are obtained by the workers.

The more the capitalists take from the total wealth produced the less there is left for the workers, and conversely, the more the workers



take from it the less there is for the capitalists. This is the centre of the whole business. The interests of the capitalists are opposed to the interests of the workers, and consequently a struggle is always going on as to who shall get most out of the pile. This is what the Socialist calls the class war.

Who gains most in this struggle is obvious. As the years roll on the wealth of the masters grows into colossal proportions, although vast quantities are recklessly expended. On the other hand, the lot of the workers grows worse from year to year. The toil and anxiety of making ends meet brings grey hairs sooner than formerly. Rarely is a member of the working class to be found hale and hearty at an advanced age. The saying, "Only the good die young," could almost be converted into "Only the workers die young."

Improved machinery and improved organisation

#### DISPLACES MORE WORKERS,

and the competition for jobs keeps wages at the level of subsistence. Even the draughtsman, the mathematician, the chemist, the doctor, and similar "professional" men, who need long and careful training to render them efficient, can only command a wage that means toil from the earliest days of manhood to the end. The capitalist buys abilities as he buys potatoes and other merchandise. Numberless are the instances where those employed in these professions have chosen the suicide's grave in preference to the grim and forbidding prospect ahead of them.

To swell their self-esteem these workers, together with the struggling small shopkeeper (who is but a salesman for the capitalist), are given the honorary title of "Middle Class." Though exploited by the capitalist the same as other workers, they are too swelled out by a sense of their own importance to allow themselves to be classed as workers. In actual fact, however, they are, in the last analysis,

#### BUT WAGE WORKERS

like the rest of us.

Workers attempt to alleviate their lot by combining in unions to keep up wages and improve their conditions. By this act they recognise in a subconscious way the opposition of their interests to those of their masters. Unfortunately the recognition is only subconscious, and the masters take every opportunity of blinding workers to their real interests and dangle before them illusive reforms on which workers employ their time and waste their energy.

For years the workers have attempted to alleviate their lot by trade union action, but at the end of it all the sorry truth must be faced that to-day their position is more insecure and

their poverty greater than ever. The claim that they might have been worse off had they not been organised is beside the point, and cannot explain away the fact that trade union action has been a failure as far as improving conditions is concerned. The general condition of the workers is growing steadily worse. At the best trade union action but

#### SLOWS THE WORSENING PROCESS—

it cannot stop it.

The fight between the possessing class and the working class has always resulted in the advantage going to the former. So long as one class owns the means and instruments for producing wealth, the other class must in the long run be beaten by the pistol of starvation. This being the position of affairs, reform is useless—revolution is the only remedy.

Those who deny the class war and seek to harmonise master and worker are the enemies of the working class, whether their intentions be good or evil. By their attempt to cloud the issue they take sides with the masters and must be treated as enemies, no matter what particular garments they dress their arguments in.

The capitalist class keeps its position as the owner of all wealth by its control of the political machinery. This is the impassable barrier between it and the working class; and yet the workers themselves put the capitalists behind the barrier by voting them into power at election time.

The workers must first realise their identity of interests as wage workers, and the opposition of their interests as a class to those of the capitalists—the owners of wealth. In other words

#### THEY MUST BECOME CLASS CONSCIOUS.

Having arrived at that knowledge they must understand that the capitalists keep their position through their control of the political machinery, and that in order to overthrow the capitalist class they must vote themselves, and not their masters, into power. They must organise into a political party which has for its sole object the conquest of political power in order to usher in the Socialist Commonwealth. That party is the Socialist Party of Great Britain. G. M.

#### CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Please note that the Head Office address is now:

17, MOUNT PLEASANT,  
LONDON, W.C.1.,

where all communications should be sent.

## PAST CLASS STRUGGLES.

As was pointed out in a previous article, early England was Feudal, and under the Manorial system rural England was composed of estates divided among villeins (a particular kind of peasant proprietors), who owed certain services to their lords.

The growth of commercialism broke up the Manorial system and introduced the Capitalist system. The foundation of the Capitalist system was laid by divorcing the labourer from the soil, i.e., converting the peasant into a "free" labourer.

Feudalism rested upon the reciprocal duties of lord and peasant or villein. The rise of the trading and manufacturing class brought about the need for a large number of labourers who could be exploited without restriction. In order that the commercial or capitalist class could become the supreme class in society the serf had to be converted into a free labourer—free of all feudal ties and relying only on wages for his living.

The commercial class, who had acquired money through trade, had steadily grown and permeated the existing system to such an extent that it was gradually breaking the bonds of Feudalism. In this the trading class were assisted by the great feudal lords themselves, who, while despising trade as vulgar, coveted its riches.

But the starting-point of capitalism was the free labourer. The landed proprietors, to get money, leased their lands and commuted labour rents into money rents. The rise of woollen manufacture on the Continent brought about a corresponding rise in the English wool trade. Then the great landowners commenced enclosing the common lands and evicting the peasants to make room for sheep. At the same time the suppression of the monasteries and the break-up of the bands of feudal retainers, drove thousands of other people to seek employment under the growing new conditions.

In these various ways the principle raw material of capitalism—the free labourer, who must work for wages or starve—was produced.

The whole system of government, however, was built upon the feudal organisation and the Court was in control. As the capitalist organisation was breaking up the feudal, it became necessary for the moneyed class to obtain supreme control of social affairs in order to sweep away the privileges and restrictions that were hampering its development. Society had to be reorganised, politically and religiously, to conform with the new economic organisation.

The religious change took the form of the Protestant Reformation. Catholicism, with its

many fast days and ceremonials, was inimical to commercialism, hence the fight of the commercial class for political power was suffused with the glamour of a new religion. Freedom of contract in earthly affairs was bolstered up by the plea of freedom of judgment in affairs spiritual.

During feudal times a struggle had been going on between the Court party and the great nobles. In 1215 the nobles forced from John the concession of the "Great Charter," the gist of which was that the sovereign could not levy taxes himself, payments having to be granted by a council of barons and bishops. In 1265 the town element (representatives of shires and boroughs) was introduced into this council of Parliament. The succeeding history is that of the struggle for supremacy of Parliament against the royal power.

The merchants, embittered by the harassing and interrupting of commerce by enemy ships and the waste of money on foreign wars, time and again refused to grant the necessary subsidies and Parliament was dissolved. But the emptiness of the regal treasury always compelled the sovereigns to re-assemble Parliament.

By the time the bourgeois had arrived at wealth, then, and desired to become the ruling power, the Crown had secured the powers of government into its own hands, but at the same time, the necessities of the regal exchequer had compelled the feudal party to concede certain privileges and powers to the new class, and in this way the former helped to dig its own grave.

At the outbreak of the Revolution the parties taking part were: The Court Party, the lords and large landed proprietors; the merchants; the small farmers or country squires; the town shop-keepers; the political adventurers or opportunists; and underneath all the poor of town and country.

The actual struggle commenced in 1642, when the Commons strove for the right to control the militia, and so take the military power out of the royal hands. In spite of the refusal of Charles to grant this request the militia were rapidly enrolled and lord lieutenants appointed.

The Lords desired to limit kingly power, the Commons to abolish it. In the early part of the war the Lords or Presbyterian party predominated and the policy of compromise was adopted. Underneath the Lords, however, were the Independents, growing daily in strength, menacing the policy and position of the Lords, and eventually compelling them to go over to the Court.

The Independents appealed only to Reason. Institutions, laws, customs, everything, was by them brought before the bar of Reason and called upon to order itself according to the will of man, i.e., mercantile man. Equality of



Rights, the "just" distribution of social property, was their cry. Let us hear Guizot speak of them.

There was no contradiction between their religious and political systems; no secret struggle between the leaders and their men; no exclusive creed, no rigorous test rendered access to the party difficult; like the sect from which they had taken their name, they held liberty of conscience a fundamental maxim, and the immensity of the Reforms they proposed, the vast uncertainty of their designs, allowed men of the most various objects to range beneath their banners; lawyers joined them in hopes of depriving the ecclesiastics, their rivals, of all jurisdiction and power; liberal publicists contemplated by their aid the formation of anew, clear, simple plan of legislation, which should take from lawyers their enormous profits and their immoderate power. Hanington could dream among them of a society of sages; Sidney of the liberty of Sparta or Rome; Lilburne of the restoration of the old Saxon laws; Hanison of the coming of Christ; even the non-principle of Henry Martyn and Peter Wentworth were tolerated in consideration of its daring; republicans or levellers, reasoners or visionaries, fanatics or men of ambition, all were admitted to make a common stock of their anger, their theories, their ecstatic dreams, their intrigues; it was enough that all were animated with equal hatred against the cavaliers and against the presbyterians, would rush on with the same fervour towards that unknown futurity which was to satisfy so many expectations.—"History of the English Revolution," Guizot, p. 216.

The principal figure in this party was Oliver Cromwell, a country squire of Huntingdonshire. Cromwell was a descendant of the unprincipled adventurer chosen by Henry VIII. as his chief instrument in the confiscation of the monastic lands, in which process Cromwell the elder succeeded, by embezzlement, in amassing an enormous amount of wealth. Cromwell's parents had further augmented the monastic spoils by the profits derived from a lucrative brewery business. Such were the origin and connections of the man who was to lead the wealthier merchants to victory.

He organised a band of religious zealots drawn from the ranks of farmers and tradesmen, who contributed much to the earlier successes of the Parliamentary forces and also considerably exalted the power of their commander.

As the war progressed the Independents gradually gained the ascendant, and Charles I. was executed Jan. 30, 1648.

By 1649 the Independents had become strong enough to declare a commonwealth with a single House of Commons and Council of State, Cromwell managing to manoeuvre himself into the position of Lord Protector. The final working out of this was that all the executive power was centred in his hands. Then commenced the much desired epoch of the Merchants.

The commercial wars of Cromwell are described by Gibbins as follows:

He (Cromwell) demanded trade with the Spanish colonies, and religious freedom for English settlers in

such colonies. Of course his demands were refused, as well he knew they would be. Whereupon he seized Jamaica (1655) and intended to seize Cuba; and at any rate succeeded in giving the English a secure footing in the West Indies. He seized Dunkirk also from Spain (then at war with France), with a view of securing England a monopoly of the Channel to the exclusion of our old friends the Dutch. . . . Not content with victory in the West, Cromwell, with the full consent of mercantile England, declared war against the Dutch, who were now more our rivals than our friends. It would have been perfectly possible for the English and Dutch to have remained on good terms; but the great idea of the statesmen and merchants of the 17th and 18th centuries was to gain a sole market and monopoly of trade, and so the Dutch had to be crushed. . . . Cromwell succeeded in his object. He defeated the Dutch and broke their prestige in the war of 1652-54, and designed to win their trade by the Navigation Acts of 1651. The contest between the English and Dutch for the mastery of the seas was already practically decided by the capture of New Amsterdam (New York), and the subsequent wars of Charles II. reign, completed the discomfiture of Holland.—"Industrial History of England," p. 123.

The defeat of the Dutch gave the English merchants the carrying trade of the Baltic and the Mediterranean. The Navigation Acts of 1651 referred to above set forth that all goods brought to England must be carried in ships of the actual country manufacturing the goods. As the Dutch had been previously the principle carrying nation, this was a direct blow at their supremacy, and also an indication of the growing power of the English mercantile marine.

Cromwell died in 1658, and shortly after the Royalist element began to regain a little power and succeeded in obtaining the recall of Charles II., but with greatly reduced royal power. This sovereign, more wily than his father, played into the hands of the wealthy class and was thereby enabled to enjoy a life of luxury. He pursued a foreign policy similar to that of Cromwell, enlarging the sphere of action of the merchants. He died in 1685, and his successor, James II., too thick headed to recognise the trend of the times, tried to restore the old supremacy of the Court.

In the meantime the French had grown in power and began to threaten the commercial position of England. William of Orange drew the attention of the English on account of the skilful way in which he harassed France. In consequence of this, and of the dissatisfaction aroused by the conduct of James, William was invited to the English throne in 1688. He landed with a force of Dutch, and with the help of the merchants and landowners defeated the Royalist forces.

William was presented with the "Declaration of Rights," after signing which his coronation was celebrated.

In the "Declaration of Rights" was incor-

porated the principles of the now all powerful capitalist class. The two chief points were—

The raising and maintenance of a standing army to be the prerogative solely of Parliament.

Levying of taxes or loans without consent of Parliament to be illegal.

The early part of the Revolution had witnessed the desire of the revolutionary Bourgeois to abolish kingly power, but they soon found that such a measure was not entirely in their own interests. The mass of the people, seeing old habits and customs so ruthlessly jettisoned, began to question even the right of private property! During the expedition for the conquest of Ireland undertaken by Cromwell in 1629, a body known as the Levellers broke out into open insurrection, demanding "true and perfect freedom in all things." This outbreak was crushed, but it frightened some of the "eternal laws of reason" out of the capitalists, hence their acquiescence in the restoration of the shadow of kingship.

The successful culmination of the rebellion put the rising capitalists in a position to reap to the full the advantages of the new system of colonisation and unlimited competition. It brought to the English working class a depth of misery and slavery hitherto unknown.

GILMAC.

### "LIBERTY AND PEACE" IN CANADA.

Recently the writer received several copies of "The Red Flag," a journal published, as it announces, "when circumstances and finances permit, by the Socialist Party of Canada." Their previous organ, the "Western Clarion," was suppressed by the authorities some months ago.

The first number of "The Red Flag" (Jan. 11th, 1919) contains in its editorial evidence of the freedom-loving nature of the Canadian government. It says: "The official organ of this party has been suppressed, and representations to Ottawa (chief press censor) are so far without results. Leaflets mailed have been confiscated and complaints ignored. Almost every letter which arrives at this office bears unmistakable signs of having been opened, though no censorship mark to that effect is on them. All such letters are unduly delayed, being some four, five and six weeks in the mails before delivery. Most of such letters contain remittances for dues or for literature, etc."

"Moreover, letters and parcels which we have despatched have failed to reach their destination. The mail of individual members of the party also suffers from the same despicable secret

ensorship. Our protests and complaints to heads of departments result only in officially equivocal and evasive replies. The greeting the writer received from the postmaster in Vancouver on making a personal representation to him was, 'You are a Bolshevik,' and that was all—he would vouchsafe of definite character in his replies to questions."

By an "Order in Council" the Canadian Government has made it an offence punishable with 5,000dols. fine, or five years' imprisonment, to be in possession of any of the Socialist or, other) literature published by C. H. Kerr and Co. of Chicago.

I take the following from a letter of a Winnipeg comrade, dated Jan. 31st: "Two Sundays ago our Local pulled off a great meeting, took in 80dols. collection and sold 35dols. of literature. . . . We decided to hold another meeting last Sunday, but owing to threats by returned soldiers could not rent a theatre and had to try the market square. We were to start at 2.30, but at 2 o'clock a parade of veterans started out to see that no meeting was held. We refused to allow our speakers to try to talk as we smelt trouble, so they cleared out our headquarters, threw our furniture out of the windows, etc., and stole all our literature—which, I hope, they read."

Then, under the pretext and cry of "Down with Bolshevism," the mob of deluded fools raided and looted all the German and Austrian clubs and "murdered" about half-a-dozen foreigners by the simple expedient of beating them to death."

The following incidents are related in the report of the "Winnipeg Telegram" (Jan. 28th, 1919): "One German was captured in Main Street, broke away, and ran into a store. Both the storekeeper and the fugitive were dragged out and given a warm five minutes. The German refused to kiss the flag, and broke away again. He was outdistancing a soldier—who yelled to an officer who was out for a stroll, 'Stop him'; the officer immediately swatted the fugitive with his cane, felling him to the sidewalk. 'I guess that'll hold him Scottie,' coolly remarked the officer, who then proceeded on his stroll quite as though he had accomplished the most matter-of-fact thing in life. Ten minutes later the fugitive picked himself up from the devil-strip of Main Street, and like the Arab, silently stole away, leaving behind a large pool of blood." Several similar incidents are recorded.

R. W. H.



**"LEST WE FORGET."****HOW THE CAPITALISTS SUPPRESSED THE PARISIAN WORKERS IN 1871.**

At last the smell of the carnage began to choke even the most frantic. The pest, if not pity, was coming. Myriads of flesh-flies flew up from the putrefied corpses. The streets were full of dead birds. The "Avenir Liberal" singing the praises of MacMahon's proclamations, applied the words of Flechier: "He hides himself, but his glory finds him out." The glory of the Turenne of 1871 betrayed him even up to the Seine. In certain streets the corpses encumbered the pathway, looking at the passers-by from out of their dead eyes. In the Faubourg St. Antoine they were to be seen everywhere in heaps, half white with chloride of lime. At the Polytechnic School they occupied a space of a hundred yards long and three yards deep. At Passy, which was not one of the great centres of execution, there were 1,100 near the Trocadero. These, covered over by a thin shroud of earth, also showed their ghastly profiles. "Who does not recollect," said the "Temps," "even though he had seen it but one moment, the square, no, the charnel of the Tour St. Jacques? From the midst of this moist soil, recently turned up by the spade, here and there look out heads, arms, feet, and hands. The profiles of corpses, dressed in the uniform of the National Guards, were seen impressed against the ground. It was hideous. A decayed, sickening odour arose from this garden, and occasionally at some places it became foetid. The rain and heat having precipitated the putrefaction, the swollen bodies reappeared. The glory of MacMahon displayed itself too well. The journals were taking fright. "These wretches," said one of them, "who have done us so much harm during their lives, must not be allowed to do so still after their death." And those that had instigated the massacre cried "Enough!"

"Let us not kill any more," said the "Paris Journal" of the 2nd June, "even the assassins, even the incendiaries. Let us not kill any more. It is not their pardon we ask for, but a respite." "Enough executions, enough blood, enough victims," said the "Nationale" of the 1st June. And the "Opinion Nationale" of the same day: "A serious examination of the accused is imperative. One would like to see only the really guilty die."

The executions abated, and the sweeping off began. Carriages of all kinds, vans, omnibuses, came to pick up the corpses and traversed the town. Since the great pests of London and Marseilles, such cart-loads of human flesh had

not been seen. These exhumations proved that a great number of people had been buried alive. Imperfectly shot, and thrown with the heaps of dead into the common grave, they had eaten earth, and showed the contortions of their violent agony. Certain corpses were taken up in pieces. It was necessary to shut them as soon as possible into closed waggons, and to take them with the utmost speed to the cemeteries, where immense graves of lime swallowed up these putrid masses.

The cemeteries of Paris absorbed all they could. The victims, placed side by side, without any other covering than their clothes, filled enormous ditches at the Pere Lachaise, Montmartre, Mont-Parnasse, where the people in pious remembrance will annually come as pilgrims. Others, more unfortunate, were carried out of the town. At Charonne, Bagnolet, Bicetre, etc., the trenches dug during the first siege were utilised. "There is nothing to be feared of the cadaverous emanations," said "La Liberte," "an impure blood will water the soil of the labourer, fecundating it. The deceased delegate at war will be able to pass a review of his faithful followers at the hour of midnight; the watchword will be 'Incendiarism and assassination.'" Women by the side of the lugubrious trench endeavoured to recognise these remains. The police waited that their grief should betray them, in order to arrest those "females of insurgents."

The burying of such a large number of corpses soon became too difficult, and they were burnt in the casements of the fortifications; but for want of draught the combustion was incomplete, and the bodies were reduced to a pulp. At the Buttes Chaumont, the corpses, piled up in enormous heaps, inundated with petroleum, were burnt in the open air.

The wholesale massacre lasted up to the first days of June, and the summary executions up to the middle of that month. For a long time mysterious dramas were enacted in the Bois de Boulogne. Never will the exact number of the victims of the Bloody Week be known. The chief of military justice admitted 17,000 shot; the municipal council of Paris paid the expenses of burial of 17,000 corpses; but a great number were killed out of Paris or burnt. There is no exaggeration in saying 20,000 at least.

Many battlefields have numbered more dead, but these at least had fallen in the fury of the combat. The century has not witnessed such a slaughtering after the battle; there is nothing to equal it in the history of our civil struggles. St. Bartholomew's Day, June, 1848, the 2nd December, would form but an episode of the massacres of May. Even the great executioners of Rome and modern times pale before the

**CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS.****ITS MEANING AND VALUE.**

One of the terms most frequently in use in Socialist propaganda, and one which may prove most mystifying to the uninitiated, is the term "class-consciousness."

What do we mean when we speak of "class-consciousness"? We mean simply a thorough knowledge of the position in society of the class to which the class-conscious subject belongs.

Socialists claim that class-consciousness is a mental condition which must necessarily precede working-class emancipation. The reason is because, owing to the peculiarly complex nature of the modern social system, the interest of the classes is obscured, and only a clear understanding of the working-class place in the social system can enable the workers to see in what direction their interests lie, and therefore what they have to fight for.

The chattel-slave, who was the property of his owner, was never in any doubt as to his place in society. His relation to his master, and his class to his master's class, were too simple to allow of obscurity. He knew that he was mere property, and hence he was in no danger of identifying his master's interest with his own. That this is true is proved by the fact that those ruling races of antiquity whose States were based on chattel-slavery could never get their slaves to fight for them—or trust them to do so—except under pledge of granting them their freedom.

With the modern wage slave the case is entirely different. He has the freedom of selling his labour power, not where he will, but where he can. He may enter into "free" contracts. These things make him think that there is no essential difference between his class and his master's save such as has arisen from difference of ability. He sees, occasionally, one of his own class rise into the ranks above, so he knows there is no impassable barrier. He finds he cannot live without wages, therefore the class who own the money which provides wages have their useful place in society. He finds he cannot get wages without work, hence it is no less to his interest, he reasons, than to his master's, to follow the policy which will provide most work. So the complexity of the relations of modern society hide from the worker the fact that he is just as much a slave as the old chattel slave, working to produce wealth for his master, and getting for himself just enough to enable him to do it.

Class-consciousness, the knowledge of his slave status, makes clear the opposition of class interests, and fits the worker for the class struggle.

A. E. JACOMB.

Duke of Magenta. The hecatombs of the Asiatic victors, the fêtes of Dahomey alone could give some idea of this butchery of the proletarians.

Such was the repression "by the laws, with the laws." And during these atrocities of incomparably worse than Bulgarian type, the bourgeoisie, raising to heaven its bloody hands, undertook to incite the whole world against this people, who, after two months of domination and the massacre of thousands of their own, had shed the blood of sixty-three prisoners.

"History of the Paris Commune." Lassargay,

**THE BOTTOM DOG.**

He loved his master dearly in the days of long ago;  
His dirty kennel and his scanty food  
To him were blessings, and he sought no other things  
to know,

And all the world looked on and called it good.  
But now, because this canine dares to bark for some-  
thing more,

The masters curse him for a greedy hog,  
And wish that they could kick him as they did in  
days of yore,  
To teach him he is but the Bottom Dog.

In days of old when foreign thieves his master's house  
would spoil,

He thought it but his duty and his "bis,"  
To guard his master's property—the fruits of others'  
toil,

With life and limb as though these things were his.  
To-day he views his master with distrust and e'en with  
scorn,

Much as the Bull looked on the bloated frog.  
His faithfulness has vanished through the terrors he  
has borne,

And now they call him "Bolshie Bottom Dog."

Ungrateful whelp! hast thou forgot thy master's lov-  
ing care?

Regardless of your puny puppy's whine,  
To shield you from the wintry blast, and summer heat  
and glare,

Consigned you to the comforts of the mine.  
Hast thou not learned in all these years the dignity of  
work?

The pride of being just a human cog  
In those vast wheels of industry that grind for those  
who shirk?

Oh! bad, unpatriotic Bottom Dog!

Now just because some dogs have lost an eye, a paw,  
or leg,

They snarl and growl at Barnes and Clynes and  
Hogge—

The master's friends—who tell them if they'll just sit  
up and beg

There'll be more offal for the Bottom Dog.  
But these are signs the mongrel, who is not devoid of  
pluck,

With instinct clearing of its mental fog,  
Will seize the thieves who rob him and I wish the  
boulder luck

To end the days of Top and Bottom Dog.

F. G. THOMPSON.



## OFFICIAL NOTICE

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

### TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free .....	rs. 6d
Six .....	od

# The Socialist Standard,



THURSDAY.

**MAY 1, 1919.**

## A MAY-DAY TALK.

On the eve of May-day, in probably the most momentous times in history, it is meet that we should have a glance about us, a little stock-taking, a summing-up of the general situation as it affects "Labour," and as viewed through the eyes of those who have made a special study of the needs and interests of the working class over many years.

Our masters are talking now of peace." But what significance has such a word for those—we were going to say who work, but we must use the more expressive term—who toil? During the great "Business War" the horrors of the industrial strife have been largely removed to the military cockpits. The burying alive of men in mines has found its counterpart in the burying alive of men in trenches; the gassing of men in the bleaching powder factories has been paralleled in the gassing of men at "the front"; the tragedy of the Titanic has been reproduced in the "atrocities" of the Lusitania; the crime of the abolition of the Plimsoll line has found its twin brother in the villianly of mined seas. These things, done in "war," and between race and race, have attracted to themselves tense attention, but there is nothing, nothing, in the whole range of battlefield horrors, that is not matched in the everyday struggle of the workers for bread and of the masters for profit, an almost common-place occurrence of the everyday existence of those who toil.

And now we are to exchange again the horrors of war for the sevenfold horrors of peace. Our masters' "gratitude" to their "heroes" has already reached the vanishing point. In little

open spaces in the London suburbs, and on the ugly blank walls of London slums, ugly little wooden shrines have been erected to the "honour" of those same "heroes"—the cheapest of cheap carpenter's jobs, but neatly varnished and glazed, and "eye-washed" with a picture of Christ or a Mona angel looking upon cannon fodder, and provided with a shelf for other people to leave floral offerings on. And inscribed upon the page of fame behind the glass, behold the names of the local warriors, with here and there blank spaces where the names of the fallen had been written in in red ink, and have long since faded from the sight of man. The symbolism of the whole thing is perfect. The shoddy show, the superstitious dope, the appeal to private charity—and nothing could better have stood for the transient nature of capitalist "gratitude" than that ironic, contemptuous, fleeting red ink.

The "gratitude" of the class for whom the war was "fought and won" is already dead. The Lord Derbies, who sweated so profusely in the khaki of the labour battalion, are, it is true now "hard at it" on the work of reconstructing—the Turf. The rich find no great problem (for themselves) in the transition from war to peace. But in other directions the work of "reconstruction" goes on about as fast, probably, as those to whom a great unemployment crisis would present a welcome opportunity to put the screw on wages desire. The shortage and consequent high price materials of every description has a fatally deterrent effect on the resumption of the ordinary productive processes of peace time, and this applies with greatest force in that most important industry where the increased cost must be saddled on a relatively permanent product—the house-building industry. There is, therefore, looming ahead, the prospect of such a time of suffering for those who toil as will indeed cause them to ask themselves what signify those little wooden shrines to working-class agony and capitalist greed.

The vampire class are getting ready for the inevitable result of the world conflict. Already the chiefs among the thugs are denouncing the victims of their blood-orgy who have the indecency to claim the out-of-work dole as lazy impostors. Pledges are being given by the Government, who got their present places and power upon lying promises to carry the work-class safely through the "transition period," that those doles (already reduced to ludicrous inadequacy) will cease to be paid in November. The Army is being strengthened with men whose pay is sufficient to claim their heartfelt allegiance to *any* duty; the police are having *their* grievances settled with a lavishness that is eloquent testimony to their future usefulness to the exploiting class. "Public opinion" has

**BY THE WAY.**

That the war has indeed been a good thing to the capitalist is overwhelmingly shown by even a most cursory perusal of the daily Press. A glance at any company meeting notice, or a study of the Excess Profits Tax, will tell the same tale—swollen profits. Another instance recently afforded I append here. The Secretary of the Grocers' Federation, addressing a special meeting of the Grocery and Provision Trade Section of the Balham; Tooting and District Traders Assn. said :

The Food Controller had been the grocers' real friend for the last four or five years, in enabling them to dispose of all their surplus stock, much of which the public would not look at prior to the war, but which during the last year or two they gladly bought.

That was one of the good things that the war had accomplished. It had been a veritable spring cleaning for them, and in other ways, such as the extra halfpenny profit on cheese, lard, and margarine, the Food Controller had done the grocers good service, as it meant that nearly nine millions sterling had been given to the trade during the year.—"Daily News," Feb. 24, 1919.

The good work done by the Food Controller (from Lord Devonport to the latest Labour occupant of the office) for the benefit of the capitalist is here testified to by one who is an interested party. Truly they who pay the piper call the tune.

In spite of the nonsense frequently indulged in by "labour leaders" and others during the past few years, that there is no such thing as a CLASS war, strange to say, signs are not wanting to show that this ever-pressing fact becomes clearer to those who have eyes to see. Recently Lord Claud Hamilton presided at the annual meeting of the G.E.Ry. Judging by the remarks he then made and the applause with which they were received, it is abundantly clear that he and those who listened to him are in no way mistaken about the matter. Enter Lord Claud—

What had happened during the last nine months? One concession following upon another on the part of the Government: concessions not to reasoned argument, not in reply to private grievances; not in the interests of justice and fair play, but to brute force. (Hear, hear.) Brute force in any shape was contrary to the instincts of the British nation. (Applause.)

We have disposed of it on the Continent. We are surely not going to allow it—fostered by those who have not risked their lives nor suffered the unspeakable miseries of trench life—to raise its obnoxious head at home. (Hear, hear.)

The time is arriving when the Government must take off the velvet gloves which they have worn too long. (Hear, hear.)—"Evening Standard." Feb., 1919.

So there you are, fellow wage-slave, it's up to you. He (Lord Claud) realises the bitter fight between the haves and the have-nots. Think it over. Then join the ranks of the workers who are organised for the war against capitalist oppression.



A few days before the House of Commons adjourned for the Easter recess a motion was introduced by the Labour Party having for its object the provision of

Pensions adequate for a healthy and useful life to be paid to all widows with children or mothers whose breadwinner has become incapacitated, such pension to be provided by the State.

Some discussion ensued, and then Mr. Shortt pointed out what this involved, namely: It means that any widow with children, however rich she may be, or any wife of a husband who cannot work, even though she is extremely well off, would have the pension.

Now this may pass for serious criticism in the House, but to me the point has no substance whatever. In the first place the pension proposed to be paid to widows with children "adequate for a healthy and useful life" would and should preclude those "rich" widows whom Mr. Shortt had in mind. If they are "rich" then they have the wherewithal to obtain those social amenities which go to make up a healthy life. And regarding the other part of the qualification, i.e., "useful," then up to the present I am unaware of any evidence existing that the rich are useful.

Concerning the remainder, referred to as "any wife of a husband who cannot work, even though she is extremely well off," then in this case also the resolution is sufficiently clear, for no pension is necessary to that section of the community Mr. Shortt describes as "extremely well off," to ensure them the means of obtaining the essentials of life.

The financial aspect of the case was also mentioned, and it is distinctly good, coming from a member of a government that has been spending very close upon eight million pounds a day in the butchery of the world's working class. It was as follows: "One has to take into consideration the amount of money which the State possesses." Now all this chatter in the House is mere camouflage. The Government had no intention of favourably considering the resolution, notwithstanding all the flowery talk of making England "a land fit for heroes," and other meaningless phrases. In conclusion, let me quote from a paper which is an avowed supporter of the Government, and from which source the previous extracts are taken—

... the House has done what it has often done before when dealing with a subject which requires big thinking and real courage. It has talked it out. Fearful to vote for such a big reform, and yet not willing to be charged with voting against it, the issue has been dodged.—"Reynolds's," April 13th, 1919.

A little more than a month ago an important event took place—that is, for the leisured class. While the "sporting" members of the working class were studying the noon papers and endeavouring to find some winners, those who toil not neither do they spin were assembling to witness the Victory Grand National. I read that the attendance was a record one, and the Commander-in-Chief of the British Navy, together with the Earl of Derby, Lord Sefton, Lord Lonsdale, and a host of other titled people, were there to celebrate the event. But a short time ago we were being told by the Leverhulmes that in the new world after the war all would have to take part in the process of wealth production, and thereby make good the deficiency caused by the war. Pardon my inquisitiveness, but when are these people going to commence?

"The 'New York Times' correspondent in Washington states that Major-General Graves, who is in command of the United States forces in Siberia, has sent a report to the War Department, in which he states that the reason for not assisting the Japanese at Habarovik was that the Japanese shot women and children and also that he did not recognise the Russians in this fight as the real enemy.

"When General March was questioned on the subject he said the Chief of Staff had nothing to say at present."—Central News.—"Daily News," April 17th, 1919.

When Lloyd George addressed the National Industrial Conference at the Central Hall, Westminster on the 27th of February last on the subject of Labour Unrest, he stated that one of the factors contributing to unrest was the high cost of living. He then went on to say—

We will get back gradually. I do not say that you will get back soon or for some years to the condition of living that you had before the war; but within the next few weeks there will be a reduction in the cost of some of the essential necessities of life. By the summer I hope that the cost of living in a working man's household will have gone down by about 4s. a week in the cost of certain necessities. By the end of March you will have achieved about half of that.

—"Daily News," February 28th, 1919.

We have now reached the period when, according to Lloyd George, we should be about two shillings a week to the good. From enquiries which I have made it would appear that this is another to be added to the long list of unredeemed pledges.

Five months after the signing of the armistice find the newspaper folk waxing eloquent on "Shall the Ex-Kaiser Hang?" To-day he is reprieved; to-morrow he is to be tried. Personally I do not think he will suffer the death

penalty. It would be establishing a horrible precedent. And one never knows what might follow. The conflicting statements made concerning this august person will be illustrated by the following items of news:—

Paris, Wednesday.—It is understood that the "Big Four" have decided to eliminate the idea of the capital punishment of the Kaiser, but they will provide some means of bringing him under the control of the Allies.

In addition there will be a strong indictment pointing out the responsibility of his leaders.

—"Globe," 10.4.1919.

Paris, Tuesday.—The Paris edition of the "Chicago Tribune," under a page-wide heading "Kaiser to be Tried for War Crimes," declares it is in a position to state that the Kaiser and other Germans will be tried before a tribunal formed by the League of Nations for violating treaties and for crimes committed during the war.

It states that the report of the Responsibilities Commission specifically indicts the Kaiser, the Crown Prince, Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Tirpitz, and others, and that it is believed the death penalty will be inflicted upon the German leaders responsible for cruelties and crimes committed during the war.—"Daily News," 16.4.1919.

THE SCOUT.

## A FEW WORDS

TO THOSE ABOUT TO CELEBRATE  
"PEACE."

Six months now have the dogs of war been leashed, yet still their snarling is the most audible sound throughout the world to-day. Orlando has gone back to Italy, and the jingo Press of Allied Europe foams ink at the mouth at Wilson, the Peace with honour—the clean Peace—indeed all those Peaces of which we have heard are still in the balance. For as the war was confined to this unhappy planet alone the dogs of war have only one bone between them.

Yet what is this Peace of which you talk so much? How will it affect the Working Class? ("How absurd the writer is," you are saying, "everyone knows that Peace is the cessation of War.") Will Peace then resuscitate the dead? Will it restore sight to the blind, limbs to the limbless? Will it strike off the shackles of slavery that bind the proletariat? Will it demolish the sunless slums of Bethnal Green or make it possible for women to obtain bread without selling their bodies? Will it prevent

future War? If it will not do these things it is no Peace for me.

Peace to me means the end of wage-slavery. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the passing of them into the hands of those who produce. It means the creation of a new and beautiful world by the overthrow of the system of society which makes wars and widows and blind men.

But, perhaps, I am exacting, think you. Maybe I am not satisfied to remain a slave on the promise of a Peace which affects my slave position not at all. You are. Ah, well, perhaps I am only a Socialist after all, and you are—well, what are you, friend? I have heard you call yourself a Free Citizen. What are you free to do? Can you exist without selling your labour to a master? Have you access to those very tools even with which you manufacture the wealth of the world? What proportion of that wealth do you receive back in exchange for your labour power? Is it enough to satisfy you, does it suffice to clothe, feed, and educate your children, as you would wish them to be clothed, fed, and educated? Or are you not forced to send them out on the labour market at the very earliest moment? And suppose you cannot find a master to employ you, does not your boasted freedom resolve itself into the freedom to starve?

What, then, if Italy does have Fiume? Will you or the Italian worker be any better off? If the German colonies be divided between the Allies, will the German workers be the losers and the Allied workers be the gainers proportionately? Not a bit of it! The capture of foreign markets as the result of War means nothing more to you and me than the continued exploitation of the working class. You wear two gold bars and four service chevrons, you have fought and captured cities in all theatres of war, but if you cannot find a master to employ you, you must starve. But was not that your position before the war? If, therefore, the division of territory, the readjustment of national boundaries, the "reparations, indemnities, and effectual guarantees" do not alter one iota the slave position of the international proletariat of which you are a member, why in the name of Reason do you worry yourself about them?

In conclusion, if you are interested in Wars, why not take an interest in your own War—the Class War—and join up in the ranks of the Socialist Party, organise with your fellows consciously and politically to overthrow Capitalism with its bloody wars and hollow peaces, and to erect in its place the Socialist Commonwealth.

S. H. S.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

## CONCERNING THE RUSSIAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—The editorial reply (in your April issue) to "A Wage Slave" states that the Bolsheviks "squashed the Kerensky crowd by suppressing the Constituent Assembly." The assumption that the Kerenskyites were in a majority in the Constituent Assembly is a very prevalent one—the Liberal weekly "The Nation," for instance, once held it—but it is quite erroneous, as I showed in the "Cambridge Magazine" of 26th October. The Kerenskyites and the Kadets—in fact all the "Oborontai" (the "defenders") as they were called during the Provisional Government era—were numerically quite negligible in the Constituent. The majority was composed of Social Revolutionaries of the Centre "led" by Tchernov, who as an individual stood for peace and also, at one time at least, for a revolutionary land policy (as I pointed out in another of my letters to the "Cambridge Magazine," see issue 11th January), but by resigning from the Provisional Government during July 1917 (in face of the hostility of Kerensky and the Kadets) when it was a question of carrying out that land policy, he showed his weakness and his activities ceased, except in so far as they were employed in heaping abuse on the heads of the Bolsheviks week after week in his paper "Dielo Naroda."

As the Russian working classes—with the exception, perhaps, of the Italians the most class-conscious in Europe, in spite of your assertion to the contrary—already held power in the Soviets and in the workshops, they acted quite rightly, in my opinion, in sending Tchernov and his majority about their business. What could Tchernov give by Parliamentary methods (so beloved by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald) that the Bolsheviks had not already given or that large numbers of the Russian masses had not already taken, for a considerable number of peasant labourers (I am not referring here to peasant owners) had already seized land—and committed "atrocities" into the bargain of which WE NEVER HEARD, OF COURSE—during the latter months of the Kerensky regime, when it became obvious to them that nothing was to be expected from "constitutional" methods under Provisional Governments!

As your space is, I know, limited, I shall now close, although I should like to have said something about the socialisation of land, the Lenin and Spiridonova ideas with regard to same, and the "chaos" to which this has led. Perhaps I may again be allowed to occupy a little of your space in a future issue.—Yours, A. P. L.

\*\* It is not easy to grasp the point of our correspondent's letter. We did not say or imply that the Kerenskyites were in a majority in the Constituent Assembly. Our first critic, "A Wage Slave," challenged us to explain how it was that "the workers of Russia overthrew the Czarist and then the Kerensky Government if they were not class-conscious." Our reply was not that the workers had returned a Kerenskyite majority to the Constituent Assembly, but that they had elected a "bourgeois majority"—"the working class voted the bourgeoisie into power." The Kerensky crowd were included in the Constituent Assembly, and when the Bolsheviks suppressed the Constituent Assembly they "squashed the Kerensky crowd" with it. We do not profess to know what was the numerical strength of the Kerensky party in the Constituent Assembly. We have (and do again) frankly confessed our ignorance on the subject of the situation in Russia, more particularly as to details, and we have ordered our policy in accordance with that ignorance. Of course, if we cared to accept every unsupported rumour that is bandied about we could make good copy in plenty, as others are doing. But the number of Kerenskyite noses in the Constituent Assembly did not concern us in the least. The point is that they were bourgeois noses, and were put in the Assembly by the vote of what "A Wage Slave" claimed was a class-conscious working class, and overthrown—by whom? By the "class conscious" proletariat who had a few weeks previously shown their "class-consciousness" by electing them? Only "A Wage Slave" has dared to tell us so yet.

And we notice that, whatever may have been the numerical strength of the Kerenskyites in the Assembly, "A.P.L." speaks of the "Kerensky regime."

"The Russian working classes," says our correspondent, "with the exception, perhaps, of the Italians, the most class-conscious in Europe, in spite of your assertion to the contrary—already held power in the Soviets and in the workshops, they acted quite rightly, in my opinion, in sending Tchernov and his majority about their business." In the first place we should be glad if "A.P.L." would point out where we have made the "assertion to the contrary" he refers to. Comparing the degree of class-consciousness of one race with that of another is a pastime we leave to correspondents who know all about it. But what does it matter whether the Russian working class are more or less class-conscious than other proletarians? Goodness knows it is not saying much to say that they are more class-conscious than the workers of this country!

The point is, of course, were they sufficiently class-conscious to seize their opportunity and

make the most of it. Our correspondent seems to think that they were. Will he tell us, then, why they elected their worst enemies to the Constituent Assembly? He will doubtless be among the first to admit that this folly, giving the ruling class of other countries the excuse that the Bolsheviks were mere usurpers, who had overthrown the chosen authority—the democratically elected representatives—of the people, more perhaps than anything else ruined their cause among the workers of other lands, and strengthened the hands of foreign capitalists in providing a screen for the Russian bourgeoisie to organise behind.

"A.P.L." need not fear that we shall weep for the dismissal of the bourgeois Constituent Assembly as such—as a bourgeois instrument, that is. As against the workers we have no atom of sympathy with the bourgeoisie, and recognise no duties toward them, no privileges attaching to them, no rights claimed by them. Our hatred of them is unutterable, and removes them entirely beyond any other and softer emotion within us. But there is another aspect of the case. Besides being an instrument of bourgeois tyranny the Assembly was the expression of the will of the Russian people. At least, we understand the basis of the election to have been such as would make it so, and even "A.P.L." in his search for an excuse for the Bolshevik suppression of the Assembly, does not say that it was not democratically elected. Without claiming anything more sacred than working-class expediency for the democratic principle, this was a reason for suffering the Assembly. For as Socialists we hold that the franchise presents to the workers the way to their emancipation. Until the workers learn to use this instrument properly they are not fit or ready for Socialism. To suppress the Assembly was simply to try to force on an unready and unwilling people a social system for which their economic conditions were no more ripe than their mental state—to challenge, in the face of that mentally and economically unready people, the organised might of the whole capitalist world. Even complete success in that challenge could not, as far as our information shows, justify the adventure. For to successfully establish Bolshevism, on the evidence to hand so far, is a step backward. It is a reversion to peasant-proprietorship on the land. As the products of the soil must therefore belong to the peasant proprietors, the products of the factories cannot belong to the community without fatal social discord. Our reasons for making this statement have been given before. The inevitable result must be the strangulation and final death of manufacture and the lapse of

Russia into a state of barbaric agrarianism, a state under which Russia cannot develop into a Socialist commonwealth.

The Russian working classes, "A.P.L." declares, held power in the Soviets and in the workshops. If that were entirely true the sequel (when we reach it) would only furnish one more proof of the truth of our contention that only by the capture of the political machinery, indicative as that event must be of the readiness of the people for the social revolution, can the working class proceed. If the workers hold power in the Soviets and workshops it appears pretty clear that their power on the military field is fiercely challenged. And after all it is there in the first place that they must be confirmed in their power.

But our correspondent's remark that "a considerable number of peasant labourers had already seized land . . . during the latter months of the Kerensky regime, when it became obvious to them that nothing was to be expected from 'constitutional' methods under Provisional Governments" illuminates the whole landscape in one vivid lightning flash. It reveals the "class-conscious" Russian worker expecting something from a Bourgeois government; lays bare the true foundation of much of the Bolshevik "power in the Soviets," at least in the rural districts; and it shows, with its context, how little our correspondent understands the real object of the Socialist determination to capture the machinery of government.

Not to hand out parcels of land to "peasant labourers (our correspondent's term, not ours) or factories to the workers therein do we aspire get possession of machinery of State, but in order to gain control of the civil and military forces, so that we shall be in a position to make the land and other means of living the property of the whole people. The "peasant labourers," disappointed in the bourgeois representatives they had so foolishly returned to a bourgeois parliament, may not have found it difficult to seize the land they wanted, but the methods they have embraced do not help them any more than did those they have abandoned if they prove unable to hold the land they have seized.

Whatever may be the outcome of the Russian revolt (and we have no doubt as to that) it may be pointed out that, just as her backward industrial development makes Russia about the least fit for Socialism of all European countries, those very conditions make her about the only one of them all where Bolshevism stood even the ghost of a chance. For people to advocate similar methods in this country is extravagant folly, with no advantages to compensate its perils.

Ed. Com.



## FINANCE AGAIN.

Any reader who has followed the fortunes of the Socialist Party in this country through the 16 or so years of its existence will not need to be told that it is not our custom to make appeals for funds through the columns of the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*. At our propaganda meetings in the highways and byways, at street corners and in open spaces, we have, of course, commonly afforded those in sympathy with our aims, but who, for various reasons, find it expedient to remain outside our Party, opportunity to do their bit for the cause through the medium of our ordinary collection; but, rightly or wrongly, it was only under direct stress that we determined to depart from our custom and ask those to whom the "S.S." mattered and the activities of the Socialist Party were of consequence, to signify the same by coming to our assistance in a time of crisis.

We do not desire to express any opinion as to whether or not the response has been satisfactory. We trust we are not so void of imagination as to see nothing beyond the "face value" of the little contributions that have reached us. Every coin, we believe, that has gone to make up the £300 we have acknowledged, represents an earnest and fervid longing for the triumph of Socialism, and most of them, the smallest not less than the largest, a real sacrifice for Socialist principles.

So far so good. But what we desire to point out now is that the need for cash is still as urgent as ever. Those to whom it means anything will be glad to see that the present issue of this journal consists of 16 pages instead of 8. This event is not altogether unconnected with our £1,000 Fund; neither is its continuance altogether independent of that fund. For, notwithstanding that larger supplies of paper are now available, the time is not yet when we can supply a 16 pp. "S.S." for a penny without incurring financial loss. In other ways also the cause calls aloud for money. Those who are able and willing to work for Socialism find their efforts stultified by lack of means. At a time when almost every worker, sick at heart of the awful plight to which capitalism has reduced the world, is asking "What is Socialism?" and when so many, interested in obscuring the truth, are giving lying, misleading, and travestying answers to that question, we who alone in this country are qualified to explain what Socialism is, are unable to spread the enlightenment abroad as we desire because we are poor and propaganda, in any phase, costs money.

We wish, therefore, to correct the idea that the need for giving money to the Socialist

movement is a mere temporary matter, or that when a "Longer for Socialism" has given one contribution he or she has done all that is needed or has paid his or her share of the PRICE of Socialism. The need for money contributions is as permanent as capitalism—just exactly. Money is the very foundation of efficient personal effort. A soldier may pull a trigger for nothing, but the cost of the cartridges must come out of somebody's pocket. In like manner, a soldier in the Socialist army may be doing good work for the cause every day of his life, but in order to make his labour truly efficient his tongue must be well backed up with suitable literature, and with a sound and virile organisation, and with a progressive battle on the political field. The personal effort, in this sense, must necessarily wait on the Party's income. Therefore we can never have enough money until the struggle ends, and an increment to our funds, inasmuch as it enables our members to do more and better work, is just as surely an increase in our strength as is an increment in our numbers.

We would urge, therefore, that what is most vitally needed is that those who think with us (and this applies with increased force to those who for the present can find little other opportunity to join in the battle) should make up their minds to give a contribution at regular periods. If we can establish our fund upon some such basis as that we shall soon be able to do great things for Socialism.

And now will friends kindly note that we far prefer to devote our space to other subjects than this, and that the absence of lengthy appeals by no means indicates that the need for finance is over.

We acknowledge tribute as under.

## EIGHTH LIST.

Previously acknowledged	£312 17 0
Hackney Branch Social	14 16 0
Wood Green Branch	1 0 0
E. Banham (Leicester)	1 5 0
E. Boden (Nairobi, B.E.A.)	19 6
A. & L. Shearstone (Nottingham)	16 0
E. M. Chelton	10 0
J. W. Blake (Staines)	10 0
H. Baker (Rayleigh)	5 6
C. D. Waller	2 9
Sheet 216. Godfrey (Tottenham)	2 15 0
" 264. Gilham & Flood (Wood Green)	4 0
" 45. Griffiths 5s. Wallis 1s.	6 0
Total	£336 6 6

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

## ECONOMICS AT CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE.

When the Central Labour College was established in 1908, the working-class movement, according to its founders, was about to be placed on a sound educational basis. Young men from the trade unions were to be thoroughly equipped with the necessary knowledge to leaven the whole labour movement with revolutionary principles. Classes were to be formed all over the country, and the "Plebs' Magazine" was to be published monthly, in order that the workers might be instructed in Politics, History, Sociology and Economics.

The founders of the college advertised their wares so effectually among the trade unions that they have reduced the debt they started out with almost to zero, and are now completely subsidised by the South Wales Miners' Federation and the National Union of Railwaymen—the college being owned and controlled by these two unions. This fact accounts for the almost purely trade-union propaganda of the magazine: those who pay the piper call the tune, and the C.L.C. tune is trade unionism, industrial unionism, labourism, or any other ism where its pupils can find jobs after they have gained their "degree" at this "Clark's College" of the labour world.

In its curriculum the college advertises economics according to Marx. But in the columns of the "Plebs" the readers are treated to the same economics they get from Municipal Reform candidates at County Council elections. In the current number, for instance, Mr. George Barker (Miners' Agent, Abertillery), says: "There are about fifty millions of debt hanging round the necks of the workers of Europe. The worker cannot pay huge dividends to the capitalist class and pay the interest on this colossal debt."

Of course not! as wage slaves they can only pay away what they receive as wages, and wages—even according to the "Plebs"—being barely sufficient to supply the worker with necessities, must be spent on necessities. If they were able to do more there would be something wrong with the capitalist system, which, generally speaking, operates in favour of the ruling class by compelling the workers to accept wages that only provide them with the wherewithal to live and propagate their kind.

In the same number Mr. W. W. Craik, dealing with the Coal Commission, asks a simple question in economics: "What is capital?" But although economics is an important subject at the college, and a correct definition of "capital" is very essential to that subject, the writer seems quite unable to give one. "What

is capital?" he asks. "Wealth used to produce more wealth," he replies, quite ignoring the fact that, thousands of years before Capitalism evolved, men used weapons and tools to "produce more wealth," and no one—either then or now—with the exception, perhaps, of avowed anti-socialists, would think of describing such things as capital.

Of course, the anti-socialist uses this more general definition to cover up or mask the true one. Capital is wealth used for exploitation. But Mr. Craik is not obliged to accept the anti-socialist definition, and, to do him justice, he does not seem satisfied with it; and as there appears to be no limit to the number of guesses allowed, he tries again. "Capital is the ownership of labour, the ownership of the labour of yesterday and of to-day," and further on still he refers to capital as "i.e., ownership."

Now, it must be obvious that capital is something that is owned, and not the act of ownership, and Mr. Craik is only adding to the confusion that already prevails when he tells the "Plebs" readers that capital is the ownership of pit props, winding gear, machinery, etc. Adam Smith's definition that capital is "wealth used for the production of profit" is a far more scientific one, and always good enough for the Socialist, because it can easily be shown that there are no profits without exploitation.

When the Central Labour College was established its object was stated as follows: "The Central Labour College is founded to train men and women for the industrial, political and social work of the organised Labour Movement, under the supreme control of the Labour organisations in the United Kingdom, and to assist in the establishment of similar institutions elsewhere."

The founders declared for independence in the three fields—educational, industrial and political. The so called independence of the Labour Party is, therefore, the measure of Labour College independence—no more and no less. The mistaken notions of the South Wales miners, and the Liberal politics of the Labour Party, form the basis of the college instruction, which is carried back to the trade union and I.L.P. branches as independent and scientific knowledge of the working-class position. Thus neither the college nor the unions can get beyond the compromising and reform attitude of the Labour Party.

Notwithstanding all their frothy denunciations of Capitalism, and their continued affirmation that they are travelling the right road toward the emancipation of the working class, they are merely supporting and countenancing a movement that opposes the ruling class within the basis of its own system, and with



no definite or settled principles for carrying through the revolution for which they admit the necessity.

They ruled themselves out of the revolutionary movement right from the first, when they said: "Just as the needs of the individual correspond to his environment, growing in complexity with his development, so the needs of the working class change and become more complex with industrial evolution. Industrial, Political and Educational organisation are each in their turn called into existence by the development of productive forces."

Thus, instead of learning from Marx that the workers can achieve their emancipation as soon as they acquire the knowledge of their class position, and see clearly that the source of capitalist power is the political machinery, the C.L.C. waits on industrial evolution—to instruct them in a new philosophy for each epoch—and marks time with the political and industrial labour leaders until the rank and file shall have marched past to achieve their own emancipation.

E. F.

### TOO LONG.

Too long they have been harnessed to the mill  
That of ten thousand lives grinds life for one;  
Too long denied an hour of blessed sun,  
From dark ere dawning sweating blood until  
Again the dark of night. So did they fill  
Your coffers to the brim with gold fine spun  
Of brain and tissue; and their labour done,  
Found grudging rest beneath a lone grass hill.

And dare they hope, ye ask, the break of day,  
When we accorded leisure of the night?  
Presume to harvest any they have sown?  
Aye, do they dare! And who shall them gain-  
say.

Or has a little hour of waning light?  
Aye, they do dare to hope and HAVE their own!  
EDMUND B. FITZGERALD.

All friends and sympathisers are asked to do their utmost to extend the sale of the SOCIALIST STANDARD in the immediate future. In particular every effort should be made to justify the present enlargement by selling out this issue. Much depends upon this being achieved. Nuff said.

### LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 158 High St.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 178. Vol. 15.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

## NATIONALISATION.

ITS FUTILITY EXPOSED.

Due, in part at any rate, to the demand of the Miners' Federation for the nationalisation of the mines, there has grown up lately an extension of the old demands for nationalising various properties and industries. The old unsupported assertions are trotted out with all the acclamation attaching to new discoveries, while a new organisation has been added to the list of those advocating these policies.

By far the most favourite subject for nationalisation has been the "land." Prominent among the organisations having the nationalisation of the land for their object are the Land Nationalisation Society, which proposes a form of purchase of the land, and the Society for the taxation of Land values, which advocates the taxation of Land Values ultimately up to 20s. in the £. Now a new organisation has been formed called "The Commonwealth League," having for its object—

"The Foundation of a Commonwealth based on the establishment of the common right to the land by the payment by each landholder of the economic rent, which is the commercial value of the site he holds."

As there is no practical difference between taxing land values and calling upon the landholders to pay "economic rent" to the State, it is somewhat curious that the two prominent Liberals who are respectively President and Secretary of the new league—Mr. R. C. Lambert and Mr. R. L. Outhwaite—should have formed

the new organisation. Moreover, in their paper, "The Commonwealth," they are full of praise for the Independent Labour Party and the resolution that body's Conference passed at Huddersfield at Easter, that "demands the socialisation of the land as the very foundation of the

co-operative commonwealth, and calls upon the Government to make it the permanent and inalienable possession of the community."

**An Awkward Question.** The stupidity and ignorance of demanding the "socialisation" of the land while leaving the capitalist system in existence generally is only equalled by the crazy clause calling upon a capitalist government to make the land the possession of the whole community, although, be it said, these things are quite in accord with the confusionist and misleading policy of the I.L.P. Yet if the founders of the Commonwealth League are so strongly in favour of the attitude adopted by the I.L.P. why did they start a new organisation? Why did they not join the I.L.P. straightaway? Or do they wish to add to the confusion already existing?

In any case the proposals are worth examining again as many workers believe that the taxation of land values, or the taking of the "economic rent" by the State will benefit their class. It sounds very plausible to say that as the land is "the gift of nature it should belong to the community," and many are led to believe that the proposals mentioned would bring about the desired result. Let us examine the matter a little closer.

Both "economic rent" and "land values" mean the same thing in the proposals of the above-mentioned organisations, though the spokesmen of the Commonwealth League nowhere define their phrase "economic rent." A simple illustration will help one to understand the principle behind this phrase.

When the War Office decided to take over a certain tract of agricultural land at Cippenham, near Slough, for the erection thereon of a motor



repair depot, some agricultural experts objected to the action because, they said, the land was the most fertile in the district, while nearer London was land of practically no agricultural value that the War Office could have taken. The decision of the War Office to retain the land at Cippenham is strong evidence that the experts were right, but what was meant by their objection?

Simply this. That if the same amount of labour-power, machinery, seed, etc., were used upon equal areas of these two pieces of land—say upon an acre of each—the resulting crops the resulting crops would not be equal in quantity or even in quality. If we suppose that under these conditions the land at Cippenham would yield 30 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the other land would only yield 20 bushels, then the Cippenham land would be said to have yielded an “economic rent” of 10 bushels per acre. The same principle applies if the land is required for other purposes—as sites for factories, business offices, or dwelling houses. Thus it is easily seen that a site close to a railway, a river, or a canal will, other things remaining equal, be more suitable and economical for a manufacturer to erect his works upon than a site that would require a large amount of road haulage to and from the works. The saving effected by building the works on the former site would represent the “economic rent” of that site. The “Land Values” that it is proposed to tax are exactly the same portions of wealth covered by the term “economic rent.” To put the matter in a phrase, “The economic rent of any piece of land is the difference between the natural properties of that piece, either in fertility or situation, and that of the poorest piece in demand.”

How is the amount of this difference arrived at? By competition. To quote the words of one of the Commonwealth League's leaflets, “He [the landholder] will pay what another would be willing to pay for the privilege of using the piece of common property he holds.” —“The Vision and the Realisation.”

We are told that this method “will throw the land open for all.” Quite true—if we add who are able to pay for it, as it will be the highest bidder who will hold the land, exactly as he does now. When a large estate in the country is up for sale it is not the landless agricultural labourer who bids for it. Nor when a town site is sold, as that of Lord Berkeley, it is not a slum-dwelling worker who buys it, but a Sir Marcus Samuel.

In other words, no one will be allowed access to the land under the Commonwealth League's method unless they can pay the market price for its use, under the name of “economic rent.”

This is just the situation that prevails to-day, as there is plenty of land available for those able to pay the market price for it. But, it will be objected, at present this price goes into the pockets of private individuals, whereas under the League's scheme it would go into the “common fund.” Yes, but *what* common fund? To this the answer is: The fund required to meet the social expenses of the community. But how are these met now? By the rates and taxes. Thus the final result of the appropriation of “economic rent” or “land values” is to reduce the amount paid for rates and taxes from other sources.

As a class the workers are not concerned with taxation under capitalism. Out of the total wealth, which they produce by applying their labour power to the materials given by nature, they receive on an average about enough to keep them in the working condition that the masters' interests demand. Obviously they have no margin left over out of which to pay either taxes or economic rent. It is thus clear that it is the masters who must pay these expenses in the form of rates and taxes, and it is they who would obtain any benefit that might result from the application of “economic rent” to these expenses.

The method might not please the section of the master class who are solely, or mainly, landholders, but it would undoubtedly be beneficial to the industrial or commercial capitalists, and is really the ideal capitalist form of taxation.

We see, therefore, that the claims of the Commonwealth League with reference to the great benefits and freedoms that will flow to the working class by the taking over by the State of “economic rent” is a sheer figment of the imagination, while the real object lying behind their project—so strongly supported by the I.L.P.—is to shift as much as possible of the burden of taxation on to the shoulders of the landlords, whom the industrial capitalists often look upon as being merely “sleeping partners.” So far as the workers are concerned it is another “red herring.”

We may deal with other forms of nationalisation in a future article. J. FITZGERALD.

#### CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Please note that the Head Office address is now:

17, MOUNT PLEASANT,  
LONDON, W.C.1.,

where all communications should be sent.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

The Socialist Party of America was always one of the most weird travesties of a Socialist organisation, among the many such, affiliated to the late “International.” A confusion of elements, seemingly as distant as the poles, found a haven in the S.P. of A. Booze reformers, Municipalist and Nationalisation cranks, anti-corruptionists, trust-busters, Anarchists of the I.W.W.—all were held in its “embracing unity.” Its many journals—mostly privately owned—advocated a multitude of doctrines often directly contradictory. The really Socialist elements—before the war, at any rate, were few and were powerless in the organisation.

As was to be expected, the war split asunder the S.P. of A., as it did most of the pseudo-Socialist parties of the world. A pro-war and an anti-war section appeared, the latter again being divided into pacifists and revolutionists. Of course, many who were “pacifist” for the first two years became “pro-war” when the United States became a belligerent.

For over four years little news of the American labour movement has reached us here, but now, by piecing together that which is filtering through we are able to make a partial estimate of what these four years of world-ferment have done towards generating a true Socialist tendency.

#### Still Opportunist.

Despite the fact that certain of the most notorious traitors to the working-class movement in the U.S.—Spargo, Russell, and others—together with a considerable patriotic element, left the party when the American Government declared war, the S.P. of A. is still dominated by reformism, and the majority of its members have as yet no real grip of Socialist principles. Its anti-war attitude was not consistently maintained, and where manifest was grounded, not on a clear understanding of internationalism, but, like that of the I.L.P. here, upon Liberal “pacifism.”

The discipline, as well as the “principles” of the party may be judged from the fact that its “lone Congressman,” Mayer London, who has not only adopted an anti-Socialist attitude on practically every matter before Congress, but has, while in office, repeatedly ignored, in the most contemptuous manner, the decisions and instructions of his own party, was re-nominated as party candidate in the recent elections.

#### The “Left Wing.”

Nevertheless the collapse of the late opportunist

“International” together with the militaristic brutality of their “democratic” government appear to have done much, in conjunction with the spread of revolutionary education, to open the eyes of a growing section of the Party to the glaring defects in its policy and organisation. This so-called left wing is not by any means a united or nationally organised movement. The size of the country makes independent propaganda on a national basis extremely difficult. The “new outlook” has developed independently in several localities and, in accordance with local influences both of social environment and propaganda, has taken on different forms. The constitution of the Party, which admits of each State division forming its own platform, by fostering a concentration upon the State organisation, has hindered the formation, by sections with like views, of a common programme throughout the Party.

“Left Wing” factions are in practical control of the Party machinery in the States of Washington, Minnesota, Ohio, and Michigan, and in the city of Philadelphia. Journals expounding the different views of various groups were started usually by a few individuals, and later were in several cases adopted or endorsed by Locals and State Parties. They include the “Socialist News” (Cleveland, Ohio), “Revolutionary Age,” (Boston), “Class Struggle” (N.Y. City), and “The Proletarian” (Detroit, Mich.)

The variety and confusion of ideas represented by this movement of revolt against the official attitude of the Party may be estimated from the statement of one who ought to know, Karl Dannenberg, who, in his “Radical Review” (Oct.-Dec., 1918) says, “Amongst the left-wingers we will find reform-repudiating Socialists, Mass Actionists, Direct Actionists with Syndicalist tendencies, Socialist Industrial Unionists, American Bolsheviks aspiring for an American Red Guard, even moderate reformers and, of course, the customary chronic kickers.” Such a conglomeration, if united in a separate party, would, it is obvious, form one in no way superior to the old body.

The fact is that in the so-called Left Wing there are not one but many currents, in numerous respects antagonistic. Much more Marxian educational work requires to be done before a sound, strong Socialist Party emerges from the present confusion. Nevertheless the fact that a considerable and growing section of the S.P. of A. have seen the folly of the old opportunist tactics is gratifying, and evidence is not wanting that in several quarters the need is strongly felt for disciplined organisation and for Socialist political action, revolutionary and uncompromising.



One of the most hopeful signs is that most, if not all, of the L.W. groups have definitely decided against the advocacy of palliatives and reforms—a stand which the S.P.G.B. was the first to take at its inception fifteen years ago. The Socialist Party of Michigan (incorporated in the S.P. of A.) claim to have held this position since 1914. The S.P. of Ohio have adopted as their "complete platform" and "only demand," "The World for the Workers."

#### "Mass Action."

A considerable section of the "Left Wing," including those responsible for and endorsing the "Revolutionary Age" and the "Class Struggle," are advocates of what they call Mass Action as a means of achieving the Revolution.

The exponents of this policy avoid definite criticism because of the indefiniteness of their proposals. Louis C. Friana, editor of the two journals named above, tells us in his book "Revolutionary Socialism," "Mass action is the instinctive action of the proletariat, gradually developing more conscious and organised forms and definite purposes." Delightfully explicit! So Friana and his school are going to rely upon the instincts of the working class to achieve Socialism. This is so much better than relying upon their reason and knowledge, for, whereas the latter needs developing by the tedious method of education, the former only requires directing. Quite the Hyndman touch!

Friana, of course, does not explain it quite like this, but such is the logical outcome of his statement. The use of the term "instinctive" to explain the actions of social groups is objectionable; particularly the absurd statement that the proletariat are "instinctively revolutionary." If there is one thing the workers would appear, to the superficial observer, to have a rooted, natural predisposition for it is capitalism. In a future article I may be allowed to enlarge on this.

The fact is, as the reader may have guessed, that the term "Mass Action" is a shibboleth used to cover a multitude of different forms of activity and as a convenient means of shelving the "problem" of Socialist tactics. Street meetings, demonstrations, strikes, insurrections, all these are forms of "Mass Action" as "soon as they acquire political significance," say the exponents of the doctrine. What are we to understand by "political significance?" If the Government suppresses a strike this strike is obviously of political significance, even though the strikers had no conscious political end in view. The gate is open for the most un-revolutionary, palliating activity to be included in these "new revolutionary tactics." There is a division of opinion among the Mass-Actionists as to whether parliamentary action can be

Mass Action or not, even though it is obviously so on the above definition, for an election is a *mass demonstration of political significance.*"

The whole conception is loose and capable of all manner of interpretations. Such confusion is just what it is essential to avoid in Socialist propaganda. "The Proletarian" (March 1919) hits the nail on the head when it says: "Is it [Mass Action] just our old friend Direct Action come back with a new suit of clothes on? We will do well to enquire into the meaning of the phrase before accepting it. At present it seems to be a rallying cry for all the elements who have repudiated the old parliamentarism. But we have had rallying cries before as a substitute for education, and they have only proved to be a snare and a delusion."

#### A New York Programme.

Only two "official" declarations of principles and policy by the above-mentioned groups have been received by the present writer. Of these one is that adopted by a convention of the I.W. section of the New York locals on Feb. 16th this year. This group has a central committee which represents about twenty sections in the State of New York. It endorses the "Revolutionary Age," published in Boston, and is now merged with the original "Mass Action" group, the "Socialist Propaganda League."

The programme opens well: (1) We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms, both local and national, and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.

(2) The party must teach, propagate, and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.

(3) The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.

It then goes on to endorse "revolutionary industrial unionism" and demands a party-owned Press, the repudiation of the old "International," and the affiliation to that recently formed in Moscow about which so little is really known in this country.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, no form of industrial organisation can be revolutionary at the present stage of the mental development of the working class, and at the same time be strong enough in numbers to function effectively in the immediate struggles of the workers on the industrial field. A union cannot be correctly described as revolutionary unless the majority of its members are conscious revolutionists. As Socialist education is the only deliberate means of hastening the formation of the latter, it is a waste of valuable time to advocate now the formation of revolutionary unions before the

ground has been adequately prepared, as the New York Left Wing suggest doing.

In addition to this positive error the programme commits an error of omission in failing to point out the necessity for political action in order to obtain control of the armed force of the State. The programme bears a strong family resemblance to that of the American S.L.P., the mistakes of which have at last been partly realised by its British namesake.

#### "Good Stuff" in Michigan.

The platform of the Socialist Party in Michigan is a much more satisfactory declaration. I append it in full:

We, the Socialist Party of Michigan, in Convention assembled at Grand Rapids, February 24th 1919, reaffirm our allegiance to the uncompromising principles of international Socialism.

We declare that the capitalist system has outgrown its historic function and become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society.

In spite of the multiplicity of labour-saving machinery and the improved methods of industry, the position of the workers becomes ever more insecure, and the class struggle between the exploited and the exploiters becomes ever more acute. The boasted prosperity of this nation is only for the owners of the means of production and distribution; to the proletariat it means only hardship and misery.

It is the capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, wars, poverty, slums, child labour, much of the crime and insanity, disease, and the commercialised prostitution. These being some of the manifestations of the present mode of production they can only be eliminated by the removal of the cause—the capitalist system. The method adopted by the Socialist Party of Michigan for the abolition of the present social order is that of political action.

The politics of the working class are comprised within the confines of the class struggle; and conversely the class struggle is necessarily waged on the political field.

By this statement we do not imply that the political action of the working class is always confined within the bounds of parliamentary procedure; nor that the means employed in waging the class struggle must everywhere be the same. Political action we define as any action taken by the exploited against the exploiters to obtain control of the powers of State; or by the master class to retain control, using these powers to secure the means of life.

The Socialist Party of Michigan, recognises the full significance of working-class organisation for the capture of the political State, and we call upon the workers in this State to unite with us to the end that we may socialise and democratically manage the means of production and distribution, and eliminate for all time the exploitation of the working class.

The basic principles outlined in the above declaration are essentially correct, though there are in it one or two errors in detail and faulty statements.

Exception must be taken to the reference in par. 4 to the "burden of armaments." The

growing cost of armaments does not decrease either the price or the value of labour power. The wages of the workers are not appreciably affected. The expense of armaments is borne by the propertied class, and by some of these it is certainly considered a burden. It is also true that, viewed from the standpoint of an "ideal" distribution of production armaments are a sheer waste of labour; but so, from this point of view, is more than half the activity of the workers. The statement shows signs of improperly digested economics, and it is calculated to sidetrack the workers into the reformist camp.

The fifth paragraph, though well-intentioned, is weak. The "politics of the working class" are mainly Liberal and Tory or Republican and Democrat, and, if "within the confines of the class struggle" at all, are on the side of the capitalists. It is hardly true to say that the class struggle is "necessarily waged on the political field." It will culminate, be decided, and largely end there, although it may partly revert to the economic field if the capitalists resist the process of expropriation upon the Socialist workers achieving political supremacy.

The Convention at which the above platform was adopted, and at which the Socialist element was dominant, took steps to eliminate reformist elements from within the party, in Michigan, or at all events to suppress their activities, by amending the State constitution as follows:

"Any member, Local, or Branch of a Local, advocating legislative reforms or support organisations formed for the purpose of advocating such reforms, shall be expelled from the Socialist Party. The State Executive Committee is authorised to revoke the charter of any Local that does not conform to this amendment."

An attitude upon religion identical with that of the S.P.G.B. was adopted and enforced by the constitution of the following clause: "It shall be the duty of all agitators and organisers, upon all occasions, to avail themselves of the opportunity of explaining religion on the basis of the materialist conception of history as a social phenomenon." The Convention unanimously endorsed as its literary expression "The Proletarian," though that paper as yet remains in private hands.

A resolution was carried condemning the national E.C. and demanding the convening of a special national conference of the party to determine the vital and urgent matters of principles and policy. That this attempt to reconstitute the entire party upon sound lines will fail is a foregone conclusion. Probably the authors have no very great hopes in this direction. What will be the attitude of its Michigan organisation if the national party adheres to the old opportunist tactics? Pro-



bably, almost certainly, the question of separation will arise. To one over here it would seem that secession would be followed by unity with the already existing Workers' Socialist Party of the United States, the principles and tactics of which are closely similar to those of the Michigan body, and which has its centre in the same locality—Detroit.

In conclusion, let me state that there is every reason to believe that not the least of the factors which have contributed to the forward movement in Michigan and, to a lesser extent, elsewhere in the U.S.A., has been the far-reaching educational influence of the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

R. W. H.

### SMALL MERCIES.

We present below our ninth list of donations to our Thousand Pound Fund, and candidly we are ashamed of it. Any of the bosses agents who may happen to have his eye glued to that acknowledgment list may very truly report to his bosses that they need have no fear of Socialism and the Socialists yet. An "ism" that is only six pounds a month strong has got to do a lot of growing before it can overthrow the capitalist system. Anyway, the great falling-off of the subscriptions to the fund brings us up against a very serious situation, and those to whom our propaganda means anything may just as well understand the facts.

The fact is, of course, we really must have a better response to our appeal. It must be remembered that the war has been ripening a magnificent harvest for us. Are we to gather it, or is it to run to waste? We cannot garner it without means. We must have books and leaflets printed, and we must send our missionaries out into the highways and byeways. We ask you to find the money.

And you can also, if you like, come along and help to spend it. We shall be very glad to share the work with you. Now, you who do so much for your masters, can't you do a little for yourselves?

### NINTH LIST.

Previously acknowledged	£336	6	6
Islington Branch	2	0	0
A Few Rebels	1	12	6
F. W. Stearn	10	0	0
R. L. Watson (Bedford)	10	0	0
Ponders End A.S.E. Meeting	12	6	½
Mr. Freshwater	2	6	
F. Finney	3	6	
F. Hawes	1	0	0
Sheet 78, C. Parker (Wes Ham)	15	8	
" 221, A. B. Dryer "	8	0	

Total £343 2 ½

### TWO BASIC IDEAS.

The ruling idea in society to-day is accumulation. Production for the sake of further production.

Everything is subordinated to this great end. New machines are invented, new methods devised and introduced so that wealth may be produced in still greater abundance. Brains, muscles, lives and honours (!) are all thrown into the melting-pot in the feverish rush to produce and accumulate.

The scientist spends his life enquiring into and systematising the laws of nature, and the fruits of his industry is applied to the stimulation of commercial development. All discoveries of the laws of nature become levers to increase wealth production.

With the introduction of the machine came the almost complete extinction of a workman's pride in his work. The machine did everything and man became only the feeder, the slave, that jumped here and there according to the requirements of the colossus.

Instead of lightening the labour of the worker, machinery has intensified his toil. It has brought him to work at all hours, and kept him working at full pressure all the time. For it has provided the unemployed.

In times gone by men produced the vast bulk of the wealth, but the coming of the machine harnessed the whole family—men, wives, and children—in the process of wealth production. The oft-repeated phrase, "the sanctity of the family hearth," is a myth circulated by the scribblers and henchmen of our masters.

At all costs the rush and hurry of production must be kept up. A breakdown in machinery is the only thing that permits a suspension of the process, from the point of view of our employers. When an accident occurs in a mill or factory, involving the injury or death of workmen, do the works close down temporarily for consideration of the catastrophe that extinguished for ever the trials and troubles of certain workpeople? The injured are (sometimes!) taken away to the infirmary, but the work goes ahead as before—machinery must not be idle for a single moment longer than is absolutely essential, as idle machines lessen the amount of wealth produced, and hence the amount of profit. In modern production workers' lives are of no account. The death of one workman but leaves a vacancy for another to fill, and there are always plenty at the factory gate to fill any vacancy that occurs.

Now what is the reason for this fever to produce and accumulate? What is the reason

at the bottom that gives the stimulus to the industrial rush?

The answer is given in the reports in the Press relating to *dividends*. Here you find so much per cent, dividend distributed by various concerns. These dividends are titles to certain proportions of the wealth produced. These dividends go into the pockets of a certain class. Broadly speaking, the greater the amount of wealth produced, the greater is the quantity available for distribution to the dividend holders.

The people entitled to dividends are those who invest money in a concern. Do the workers invest? Of course not. The worker receives in the form of wages only what will keep him in varying degrees of comfort—or poverty, to enable him to continue working and reproduce his kind.

The people who draw the dividends are those who by ownership and control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth reap the fruit of the workers' toil, viz., the capitalists.

In spite of the profusion of wealth resulting from the application of machinery to production, there is, as a notorious Welshman once said, "a greater poverty in the aggregate in the land to-day than there has ever been." The rich grow richer and the poor poorer. The greater the wealth the greater and more widespread the poverty. The poor are the wealth-producers—the working class. The rich are the wealth owners and idlers—the capitalist class. The workers are poor because the capitalists own the wealth produced.

We read in reports of the business at the Coal Enquiry that certain individuals draw hundreds of thousands a year in Royalties—for what? For working? No! They haven't soiled their hands in that vulgar pursuit all their lives. They drew the royalties because they chanced to be the offspring of certain landowners. In other words, because they were born into the charmed circle of the capitalist class.

As wealth is privately owned to-day, then the greater the accumulation of wealth the more luxury and splendour there will be for the private owners—the capitalists. This is the cause of the ceaseless whirr of the machine; this is the reason accumulation is the prevailing idea or aim throughout Capitalism.

The ruling idea of the system advocated by the Socialist is production for the sake of consumption; production organised to satisfy the requirements of all the members of society. Instead of aiming at "an immense accumulation of commodities," the Socialist aims at an

immense accumulation of comfort and happiness distributed over the whole of society.

In the existing state of things there is social production but individual appropriation. The Socialist would abolish this contradiction and substitute Social appropriation of the Social products.

Under Capitalism the laws of nature have been harnessed to industry. Steam, gas, and electricity have shown their capacities as prime movers. The transmitting mechanism and the tool have been developed to a marvellous pitch of perfection. The development in the co-operation and division of labour have reached a point where each need only perform a simple function in the vast and complicated mechanism of production.

Capitalism has shown us that wealth can be produced in abundance with a comparatively small expenditure of time and energy on the part of each of us. It has, therefore, performed its historic mission and signed its death warrant. It remains for us to profit by the lesson it has taught.

An organism must adapt itself to its environment or perish; the same is true of a given state of Society. Capitalism cannot control the forces it has brought into being, therefore it must perish, and a new society will arise out of its ruins. The various commercial crises that occur at intervals due to the breakdown of the gigantic system of credit; the increasing vastness of each succeeding war; the multitude of varying devices that fail to assuage the seething mass of (largely blind) discontent; and the many other incidents of common knowledge, all show that Capitalism is steadily staggering to the breaking-point.

So long as the vast capacities of modern production are under the control of one class, and are used for the aggrandisement of that class alone, we will have the strange spectacle of poverty in the midst of plenty—a society of wealthy idlers and poverty-stricken workers.

We must, therefore, take advantage of the lesson Capitalism teaches, organise for its overthrow and the introduction of Socialism if we would abolish poverty for ever. The means lie ready to our hand provided by the capitalists themselves—the capture of the political machinery which sustains the capitalists in their privileged position. GILMOR.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.







pass under review), they first eulogise him as a German prophet of the Bolshevik regime. Next they picture him as a contemporary and compatriot of Bismarck, remarking, without producing a shred of evidence, that both, Marx and Bismarck, had a common faith in the cult of the State. They conclude by relegating him to a position somewhere beneath themselves in the realms of understanding. "He saw, but not with complete understanding," they say. "His mind was too severely handicapped. The embitterment of poverty does not conduce to clarity of insight. . . . The abstractions of Richardo and the metaphysics of Hegel, reared in the British Museum library . . . ensures a progeny of fallacies." Not one of which fallacies, again by the way, do the committee place on record.

This humptious committee with the fraudulent name does not approach a single question scientifically or even seriously. There are whole pages devoted to what they term sabotage. Because the bricklayer proclaims 500 bricks a day's work in opposition to the master's demand for 1,000, that is sabotage; and "the bricklayer is in the same galley with the trusts that restrict output in a falling market to keep up prices, or buy and suppress inventions and processes that would scrap their plants.

Whether he is or not matters nothing. The essential fact is ignored. The worker sells his labour power. The capitalist buys it and claims the right to work it to its fullest capacity. The question for the worker is, what is the extent of his power to do so?

The committee failed to detect the antagonism between the buyer and the seller of labour power, and consequently failed to see the impossibility of reconciliation. Instead, they followed up the reasoning of the bricklayer to the point where this attempt to put a limit to the extent of exploitation resulted in a reduction of the work per day by one half, and a rise in wages of 100 per cent.

Had they taken the trouble to investigate the facts they would have found that their theorising never reached that far, and could not have ended there if it had. They would have discovered, if they had investigated, that the bricklayer never even reached the first stage in their journey, that of successfully limiting the output for a working day. Long before they reached that far the masters showed that they had full control of the situation. Bricklayers were made in shoals: American methods of building were introduced that simplified and cheapened, and in a few years the bricklayers were forced to submit to a bondage more tyrannical and exacting than anything in the annals of the trade. The war gave them a brief respite because they were in demand for the building of munition

factories and aerodromes. But that work having ceased, they are once more at the mercy of the masters, who demand everywhere, as they do in all trades, that the day's output shall only be limited by the physical powers of the worker.

The committee reach the climax of absurdity when they describe "bearing," or "selling short" on the Stock Exchange as sabotage. It surely needs but little knowledge in economics to see that all such operations are merely gambling moves, whereby wealth changes hands. They have no effect whatever on actual production—or even on prices, when the average of a cycle of fluctuations is taken.

On the war their logic is a curiosity. On page 35 they say that "sabotage practised covertly by men of business, advocated openly by extremists of labour, applied deliberately by suffragettes, was one the major forces that made for war," and that "The popular verdict fixes the guilt on the Central Empires for the preparation and proximate causes." On page 37 we are told that "the hell's broth on which the world has lately been supping had many cooks to prepare it."

The culprits are the conventional parties and their insurgent counter-parties. These are the Liberals, Imperialists and Financiers on the one side, and the Radicals, Socialists and Anarchists on the other." And on page 42 they say, "On one side the party of order sees a way of escape through a 'good' war, capable of uniting the whole nation against the common foe."

It is scarcely necessary to point out the disparity between these statements. First of all it is sabotage and the Central Powers; next it is the conflict between the so-called progressive forces and the party of Order; and lastly it (the war) was the only means of escape from revolution open to the party of Order, i.e., the capitalist class.

But with all their talk of sabotage they are totally blind to the fact that it is a natural fruit of the capitalist system. Profit being the motive for production, restriction of output to force up prices, and the excessive waste entailed in extensive advertising are explained. The wholesale destruction of wealth in the world war is explained likewise, as a conflict between capitalist groups over markets in which to realise their profits.

Having expressed their detestation of pre-war conditions and postulated the futility of social reform, the committee proceed to outline the remedy, or alternatives with which society—or, to speak more correctly, the capitalist class—were, and are still, faced.

"To escape alike the Scylla of War and the Charybdis of Revolution by boldly steering for a peace which contains within itself the 'moral

(Continued on p. 102.)

## THE WAR TO END WAR,

Since August 1914 the assertion has been continually cropping up in the most unlikely places that the "Great War" was being fought in order to prevent, for all time, the possibility of such a disaster ever again overtaking the world. The workers of every country engaged in the struggle were urged to come in and do their bit, so that when the strife was over and one side or the other emerged victorious a reign of perpetual peace should be inaugurated.

Papers and people of the sentimental type, such, for instance, as the "Daily Mews" and Harold Begbie, were particularly vehement in their repeated declarations that the war that has been devastating Europe for the past five years was, must and should be the last, or as some of them put it, the very last war.

A great many people believed it. Undoubtedly many men joined the Army and fought and died in the belief that they were acting in the best possible way to prevent the recurrence of such an overwhelming catastrophe. They were inflamed with what is so often, and so erroneously, considered the noble idea of self-sacrifice, were willing to go through a course of brutal and degrading training in the art (!) of warfare, allowed themselves to be sent abroad to kill and be killed at the command of their superior officers, thinking that they were thereby helping to make future generations safe from the horrors of militarism. They were most of them quite sincere in the matter. Mixed with the contempt one cannot help but feel for their wrong-headed and foolish idea of patriotic self-sacrifice, we may perhaps spare a little leaven of pity for the waste of what was in its inception a not altogether ignoble impulse.

The utter foolishness of this idea of the late war having as one of its results the ending of all warfare, can be seen at once if we consider the world situation to-day.

The Entente and its allies are fighting the Hungarian revolutionaries.

The Entente and the reactionary Russian party are fighting both the Bolsheviks and the Poles.

The German Government are fighting the German Spartacists.

The Bulgarian Government is fighting the Bulgarian revolutionaries.

The Italians and the Jugo-Slavs are on the verge of a conflict (if such has not already started).

The Greeks are calling up their 1920 class of recruits, to be ready for anticipated happenings in the Balkan States.

New Zealand is alarmed at what it considers to be the aims of the Japanese to dominate the Pacific.

There are rebellions and riots, accompanied by wholesale executions and repressions, in India and Egypt.

Ireland is only kept from an outbreak by the menace of machine-guns and tanks.

There are strike-riots in Australia and in America.

Conflicts, with many casualties resulting, have taken place between the French authorities and the French trade unions.

England is nominally the most peaceful, but even here there is an undercurrent of discontent among all sections of the populace, which may at any moment break through the sheep-like docility of the British working man.

Perpetual peace has not even started to be yet awhile.

Anyone who has even the most rudimentary knowledge of economics knows how futile are the expectations as to a capitalist war, waged all capitalist States, resulting in a cessation of by armed conflict. While capitalism lasts; while certain groups of capitalists struggle among themselves for the possession of the most-favoured—from the profit-making standpoint—portions of the earth; while you have such groups intriguing one against the other for the possession of the world markets, you must inevitably have a condition of things that leads eventually to war. There comes a time when neither of the rival groups will give way: then comes a deadlock and an appeal to their respective governments, leading up to appeals to the credulous working man in the various countries to join up and fight "the war to end war," "the war of liberty," "the war to make the world safe for democracy," "the war for the rights of small nationalities," and the war for all the other catch-phrases with which we have become familiar during the last few years.

The way to end war is by the destruction of the root-cause of war, that is by the destruction of the capitalist system itself. There can be no escape from the spectacle of bloodshed, rapine, and horror while capitalism lasts.

The Socialist, from his inception as a Socialist, has for his part been waging a war more bitter and deadly even than that which has reddened the plains and fouled the air of Europe. His war is the age-long struggle of the dispossessed against the owners of the world's wealth. This is the last and greatest war, the waging and winning of which stand as beacons of hope in this dark age of death and destruction.

To his comrades in the fight the writer sends a message of courage and endurance; to the non-Socialist members of his class (his future comrades) he voices an appeal for a patient and intelligent examination of the principles of Socialism; to both he reiterates his assurance



of the final speedy emancipation of his class from the thralldom of capitalism to the new-born freedom of the Socialist Commonwealth.

F. J. WEBB.

### BY THE WAY.

But a short while ago the agents of the master class were busily engaged informing the inhabitants of this isle of the "perilous" condition of "our" troops in Russia.

Now it would appear from what one sees and hears that the average man at that time was somewhat disinterested about the internal condition of Russia. It seemed to him a scrap between the Bolsheviks and those who would restore the monarchy; and consequently he did not rush to embark for Russia to preserve law and order and, incidentally, of course, allied interests. Consequently a good "stunt" was the desideratum to act as a fillip for recruiting. What better idea could the wily ones hit upon than that "our" troops were in peril? This, together with special engagement fees, it was hoped would secure the men. And so it came to pass that whilst trade unionists and other bodies were "protesting" against British intervention in Russia, the authorities were quietly shipping the men away. The plea of the masters for men to extricate their "comrades" was successful. We must now adopt the Asquithian policy of "wait and see" whether "our" troops will be withdrawn when rescued from the "perilous" condition, or, having whetted the appetite for another campaign, like Oliver Twist, they will ask for more.

How beautifully staged was the departure of these troops who were so nobly setting sail to act as rescuers of those in "peril," including in a special sense, British and French bondholders! Picture papers gave us a glimpse of the stirring send-off accorded to the men, and the penny-aliners also entered into the spirit of the thing. Let me quote a passage—

A magnificent public send off was given at Southampton last evening to a contingent of troops bound for North Russia. It was the first occasion during the war on which civilians were permitted to witness the departure. The Mayor addressed the men just before they sailed, bidding them God-speed and good luck.

The transport was named the Tzar. . . A band played "Auld Lang Syne" as the transport cast off.

Nearly 2,090 men embarked at Newcastle yesterday on the troopship Czaritza.

Many of the men carried miniature flags in the muzzles of their rifles, and on the carriages bringing them to Newcastle were chalked waggish inscriptions, such as 'The Trotsky Stormers,' 'First Stop Russia,'

"The Old Red Army," and "Who fears the Bolsheviks?" —"Daily News," May 13th, 1919.

I remember reading somewhat similar vapourings nearly five years ago. Then it was "Non-Stop-Berlin" chalked on the army paraphernalia. In those days the Russians were gallant fighters, fighting with "us" for truth and righteousness, and the "Times" military correspondent told us daily of the mighty movement of the "Russian steam roller," and how it would be in Berlin by Xmas, 1914.

I should have thought that those people who possessed the directive ability and large business brains which are peculiar to the Lloyd Georgian Government would not have permitted so incongruous a thing to happen as the jollification afforded by the departure of troops for a new campaign and a statement in the House on the same day regarding the peace celebrations. It is decidedly a rotten joke. In the self-same paper that records the previous extract appears the following:

Mr. Bonar Law told the House of Commons yesterday that the Government proposed shortly to make a statement of their views on the whole question of the peace celebrations. Whether it would be possible to hold them at Whitsuntide depended on the events of the next few days.

Asked whether it was proposed to celebrate peace while half Europe was still fighting, he replied that, personally, if a treaty were concluded with our chief enemy, he thought it would be a subject for rejoicing. The Government were considering the suggestion that Marshal Foch should be invited to be present.

An interesting item: "Mr. C. B. Stanton the Labour member, hoped for the resumption of the pre-war Royal garden parties, where their Majesties met members of the House of Commons and leading men and women from all classes.—"Daily News," May 16th, 1919.

After the "horrors" of the "Germ-Hun" and the "Bolsheviks" come the massacres of the Jews by the Poles. An item of news from a New York correspondent stated that one hundred thousand Jews participated in a protest last night in Madison-Square Garden and neighbouring streets against the Polish pogroms.

Mr. Charles E. Hughes, who was the principal speaker, declared that he had verified the reports of Jewish massacres by the Poles and found them true. His denunciation of the anti-Semitic attacks by the new nation, which owes its being to the benevolence of the Great Powers, created a profound impression. —"Daily Express," May 23rd, 1919.

What will the self-righteous "Big Four" say now?

It does seem paradoxical that it should be necessary for the men who have been fighting the "country's" battles (I prefer to call them the capitalists' battles) to have to range themselves inside various organisations, all purporting to be in existence for the purpose of assisting discharged and demobilised soldiers to obtain what is due to them from a grateful country.

Likewise almost every capitalist rag has its bureau, or correspondence column, to explain to the unwary who have been enmeshed in things military how to obtain some grant, or gratuity, or pension, etc., which seems to have been overlooked or diverted to the wrong channel, and also to explain when a pledge is not a pledge, and for other kindred Purposes.

I frequently read these agonising questions and answers, and am compelled to agree that the gentleman seeking Parliamentary honours was correct when he addressed his audience as "hard-headed sons of toil." Hard-headed they must be to tolerate the insults hurled at them and the miserable treatment meted out to them by those whose vile interests they have been defending.

The following, by a "Service correspondent," is typical of many of the items that appear from time to time:

#### PROBLEM OF THE DISABLED.

It is a crying shame and disgrace to see the huge number of crippled, maimed, and smashed men lined up any day outside the Labour Exchanges. Many of these unfortunates are obviously unfit for labour of any sort, but owing to their ridiculously inadequate pensions they are forced to hunt the streets looking for jobs. Those men have come back broken in the country's wars and are the first claim to be met by the State. Employers who were among the first to wave the flag and induce their staffs to enlist now seem among the last to play the game to the returned crocks. The right to live or work must be demanded and secured, and if the disabled man is unfitted for the labour market then adequate pension has got to be made without delay to see that he shall spend the rest of his career in comfort and decency.

—"Daily Herald," May 22nd, 1919.

The pitiful lack of understanding displayed by these folk of each and every phase of capitalist activity is amazing. Through apathy and indifference to the things that really matter—working-class education and the way out of the wages system—they were easy prey five years ago to the tricksters who were leading them to the shambles. So, used to looking at things through capitalist spectacles, they turned and vilified other workers who presented a different point of view. Now, at long last, they are learning the bitter truth by experience. The songs and sayings of nearly five years ago—"We don't want to lose you, but we think you ought to go." "What do you lack, Sonny?" and similar piffle—have now been relegated to the

limbo of forgotten things. The bald facts now stand out clear and plain for all to see: they have served the masters' purpose and, like the orange that has been sucked dry, they are flung out into the highways as of no further use.

Perhaps ere long these maimed and physically wrecked members of the working class will see the need for studying their place in society and join with us in the attempt to usher in the dawn of a better day.

I am glad to observe that the War Office is not devoid of humour. How's this?—"Some conscientious objectors are informed on their discharge papers that if they attempt to join the Army again they will be liable to two year's hard labour."—"Daily News," May 20th, 1919.

A dinner took place a short while ago in connection with the Industrial League, when a number of employers met a gathering of labour leaders and shop stewards and evidently discussed how they could more efficiently exploit the workers. On this occasion Mr. Clynes delivered himself of the following gem:

Trade unionism is now twice as strong in numbers as when the war began, and several times stronger in point of authority and power of insistence on its demands. They did not recede one inch from the right of the organised worker to use his organised power: but they had no right as poor people to rob the rich of what was theirs, as the rich had no right to rob the poor of what belonged to them. Changes sought must be through democratic institutions. —"Daily News," April 26th, 1919.

Exactly, Mr. Clynes. We seek a change from the private ownership in the means of living to common ownership by democratic action, that is, by a majority of the workers first understanding the need for a change, and, secondly, organising with the Socialist Party to effect it. But with regard to "poor people robbing the rich," well, sir, it is a physical impossibility. The poor are poor simply because they are robbed of what they produce by the class you, sir, so ably defend.

The discussion on the "peace terms" makes interesting reading. The following titbit from a special correspondent is distinctly good. He says: "There is a good deal here to provide food for reflection." What was once called annexation is now termed "acceptance of a mandate under the League of Nations." The two things may be practically identical, or they may be—as they should be—poles apart." —"Daily News," May 20th, 1919. As the Allies all desire some plums the arrangement for "mandates" seems to be an eminently suitable one.



In the early days of the war we were constantly being told that "we" (the capitalist class of this country) were unprepared for war. To use the vulgar vernacular, the Germans done the dirty on us. To those who were not mentally asleep this sort of thing had little effect. They knew it was not true. Plenty of evidence has since come to light to prove this point. But more especially do I notice the following from Lord French's book on the war, published in the "Daily Telegraph" (April 29th): "The British and French General Staffs had for some years been in close secret consultation with one another on this subject. (The point of concentration for the British forces on their arrival in France.) The area of concentration for the British forces had been fixed on the left flank of the French, and the actual detraining stations of the various units were all laid down in terrain lying between Maubeuge and Le Cateau. The headquarters of the Army were fixed at the latter place." THE SCOUT.

#### CAPITALISM'S SAVIOURS—Continued.

equivalents of war.' We have to find the formula of a peace that is not the negative thing, the mere war-peace of the Victorian era, but is something positive, charged to complete the process of conversion begun in war, by carrying the ferment of idealism on into a peace war, a 'holy' war, constructive, evocatory, militant, yet also campaigning ruthlessly against diseases, poverties, ignorances, follies, vices, crimes."

The "process of conversion," etc., refers to the co-ordination of Liberals, Imperialists, and Financiers for the purpose of "organising the nation for war," who, the committee claim, "given the opportunity of high public endeavour, compose into a workman-like trio of real political efficiency." Then high purpose must be carried over to win the peace, says the committee, and further: "During the war there was an impulse to place the energies of the warring societies at the disposal of their chemists, physicists, engineers, and chartered accountants. These, together with rural and town planners, educationists, economists, experts in health, intellectuals and administrators, should be entrusted with the conduct of the campaign against poverty. While poets, singers, musicians, artists and writers should work up the necessary enthusiasm."

Briefly, the Liberals, Imperialists, and Financiers, i.e., the active section of the ruling class, will hand over to, and assist the sociological experts in a holy war against poverty. The aesthetes, intellectuals, and the clergy will work up the enthusiasm and "evoke a spiritual

activity," and the result is to be Eutopia—which is the opposite of Utopia because it is "here and now."

These are the new materials and forces in the scheme that is seriously put forward as an alternative to "another 'good' war" on the one hand, or revolution the other.

The committee's observations and reasoning are false from the very outset. The various sections of the ruling class in all the belligerent countries, it is now apparent, far from co-ordinating in the common interest, only entered the war to safeguard or extend their commerce and territory, and only pooled their energies and resources because their class—or group—interests were assailed. They placed their class interests, for the time being, above individual interests, as they invariably do when those interests are threatened, either by rival groups of capitalists or by the workers.

As the working class have no share or interest in commerce or territory, whatever happened, they stood neither to gain or lose, but remained wage-slaves as before. All that the ruling class did toward winning the war—and the chief thing they did was to force the workers into the conflict—they did with the sole object of achieving and consolidating their position as the dominant group among the capitalists of the world. They acted during the war as they acted during the peace, in their class interest, but, if possible, with the exercise of greater brutality and hypocrisy.

The three groups, Liberals, Imperialists, and Financiers, constitute the old gang we knew in pre-war days. They still have the power—through the control of the political machinery—and still rely on poverty to drive the workers into their workshops. Consequently to abolish poverty would be to undermine their own position as a dominant class.

The committee have already shown how the "aesthetics, educationists," etc., are dependent on and under the control of the ruling class, either by convention or through the State. We may, therefore, leave them out of consideration. All the professions are too busy—like the rest of the workers—earning salaries and fees to start an independent movement of their own, unless it is in their own interest along the lines suggested by Bernard Shaw.

The committee's alternative, consequently, resolves itself into a flimsy idealism with no substance. It simply camouflages the fact that the old gang retains supreme power over the working class, and the basis of the system is left untouched.

If the Sociological Society were what they pretend to be—coldly analytical and unprejudiced—instead of collecting all the confusing

details and non-essentials that appear on the surface, to fling in the eyes of the workers as dust to blind them, they would have brushed them aside, and laying bare the fundamental basis of existing society, the class ownership of the means of wealth production and the merchandise nature of human labour power, would have discovered in that basis the real cause of poverty. The remedy, to establish society on a basis of common ownership and democratic control, would then be apparent. F. F.

#### WHAT THE LABOUR PARTY STAND FOR.

The Socialist Party is often accused by members of the Labour Party of being dogmatic, and to this charge we invariably reply that the truth cannot be dogmatic. It is, therefore, up to them to show wherein our principles and the propaganda founded on those principles, are false or inaccurate.

But we do not stop there by any means. The utterances of the Labour Party are everywhere and at all times loose, confusing, and utterly false or unscientific. They violently detest being pinned down to exact definitions: it either reveals their ignorance or exposes the fraudulent character of their general propaganda. Hence their hatred of the party which give facts, figures, and evidence for all the principles and opinions they hold, and define accurately every economic and political term they use.

The official organ of the Independent Labour Party, the "Labour Leader," is chiefly concerned in interesting the workers in capitalist politics from a supposedly labour standpoint. Its leading articles criticise or offer advice to the Government on questions of taxation, trade, unemployment, and so forth. Claiming, as the membership do, to understand Socialism, it should be quite obvious to them that these questions are but parts of the entire capitalist machinery of exploitation, and as such should claim their attention not as things to be modified, or palliated, or suffered in any form or degree, but as things to be abolished together with the iniquitous social system to which they belong.

On the question of taxation the Labour Party do no more than help the Liberals—who, generally speaking, represent the manufacturing interests—in their efforts to shift the burden of taxation on to the shoulders of the land-owning section of the master class—whose interests, generally speaking, are looked after by the Tory Party. The Labour Party protest against taxes on food, and as the manufacturer knows very well that cheap food for the work-

ing class means the payment of lower wages by him, and knows also that taxes on food are paid by him through higher wages, he blesses the Labour Party, and out of sheer gratitude for services rendered, and with an eye to securing similar services in the future, helps its leading lights to seats in the House of Commons. Not understanding, or not daring to show, where and how the robbery of the working class takes place—i.e., in the mines, mills, factories, workshops and the like by the expropriation of the product of their toil—the Labour Party uses the question of the taxes as a stunt to gain their political ambitions.

The same with trade. The British Labour Party, loyal to the British capitalist, stands valiantly up for British trade, and offers advice to the Government on the best means of securing advantages over other nations for the capture of a larger slice of the world's market. How does this affect the working class? Not at all, because their real interests are not connected with the nationality of their masters, or even the country in which they are enslaved. The workers go where work is—they have to—and emigration goes on continuously during periods of good and bad trade.

True, when trade is prosperous more workers are employed and wages may rule slightly higher, but as no policy adopted by the master class can maintain trade at a high level of prosperity, both capitalists and workers have to submit to the fluctuations in trade that recur periodically.

Whether the balance of trade swing from East to West or from North to South, all that the worker gets from the process, after all the higgling and shuffling, after all the treaties, tariffs, and wars fought for commerce, is a bare living wage.

On the question of unemployment the Labour Party adopts an attitude of protest against the donation scheme, calling upon the Government to provide useful work for the unemployed, even if they have to establish national workshops. They are moved not so much because of the needs of the workers (some of whom Mr. Clynes says are malingering) but because it would be better to produce at a loss than to have "this dead weight of expenditure." Their concern is all for the taxpayer—the capitalist—and their only thought for the worker is that he should be kept profitably employed, i.e., exploited to his full capacity.

What the Labour Party never tell the workers is that the wealth of society—produced by them alone as far as the human factor is concerned—is appropriated by the capitalist class, and that the wages the workers receive are the price of their labour-power, determined by its cost of



production. Competition for jobs prevents wages rising above the cost of living, and all the wealth the workers produce above their total wages is stolen from them by the master class.

The Labour Party never proclaim this robbery of the working class, nor the vital need for Socialism as the only way to stop the robbery. Sometimes they call themselves Socialists and sometimes they publish pamphlets professing to make Socialism clear, but which, purposely or inadvertently, only add to the confusion already existing on this most vital of all questions affecting the welfare of the working class.

The "Labour Leader" for the 8th of May last contained within its pages an article which professed to answer the questions—"What is Socialism? How and when is it coming?" In reply we are first informed that "Socialism means the public ownership of the means of life," next we told that "Socialism insists that the community shall own and control the means of life," then again they tell us that "Socialists only insist on the public ownership of capital in order to effect a fairer and juster private ownership of wealth," next "Socialism means complete adult suffrage for all men and women, free from any property qualifications," etc., then "Socialism stands for the great moral principle of 'each for all and all for each,'" and finally, there is the Object of the party as stated in the Constitution—

"To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry and service."

Let the average worker, after his day's grind in the factory, workshop, or office, try to build up or sort out a tangible meaning or definition of Socialism out of this jig-saw puzzle of conflicting statements. It is but one instance of many. The propaganda of the Labour Party is everywhere just as unscientific, confusing, and contradictory. On topical subjects its attitude is Liberal; on Socialism non-committal or misleading.

Let the reader compare the above quotations with the Object and Principles of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, and he should at once perceive why we oppose the Labour Party.

F. F.

#### LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 179 Vol. 15.]

LONDON, JULY, 1919

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## A MATTER OF DEFINITION.

A CAPITALIST APOLOGIST TACKLED.

Some capitalist writers, in their philosophical peregrinations around and about such questions as "Democracy," "Revolution," etc., display an amazing ability at handling abstract principles, connected therewith, true in themselves, and utterly opposed to the fundamental principles of capitalism, not only without revealing their antagonism to the system, but, until their premises are closely examined, actually to support the capitalist State.

Thus A. M. Drysdale in a series of articles in the "Daily Chronicle" tries to prove that revolution, instead of being a socially organic necessity at certain intervals in human history, is always a reactionary movement of minorities. His reflections, in themselves rather more interesting than the usual capitalist drivel on such subjects, are, however, based upon a total misconception of the thing he makes the centre of his discourse, i.e., revolution. In this respect it is rather unfortunate for him that he insists on the vital importance of definition and classification, because he makes a complete hash of the only definition he attempts—the definition of revolution.

A revolution is anything accomplished, or possible of accomplishment. Attempts do not count. In mechanics a complete turn of a wheel along a plane bringing it to rest at a fresh spot is a revolution. A revolution in industry is not accomplished until the chief means and methods of production have been changed in form and character, as from handicraft to machine production, while a social revolution has not been effected until the class that is dominant has been supplanted by the class beneath it in the social scale.

Such a revolution was achieved by the capitalist class when they finally overturned the rule of the feudal lords and monarchy, and made the Commons supreme. In that revolution feudalism was subverted and the manufacturing and merchant class became the rulers of society. From that time onward there were but two classes in society: the victorious capitalist class and the working class. The latter being an enslaved class, must seek its emancipation from the dominance of capitalism through revolution, which can only mean the conscious application by the working class of principles that will change the basis of society from class ownership in the means of life to common ownership with democratic control.

Anything less than this is not revolution, and only those who make this their object can be correctly termed revolutionaries.

To Mr. Drysdale, however, everything that is "unconstitutional or anti-Parliamentary" is revolutionary. He says—

"The essence of the British Constitution is the unanimous acceptance of the majority opinion of the time, after, by all the processes of debate and discussion—public meetings, leading articles, elections, first readings, second readings, committee stages, third readings, royal assents—such opinion has been given the definite form we call Act of Parliament. Conduct (not criticism or agitation) opposed to that presentation of the national will is revolutionary."

These processes, necessary for the manufacture of opinion among the workers that coincide with capitalist interests, are universally admired by the capitalist class, and, of course, by Mr. Drysdale, for that reason. Their fraudulent pretension to be democratic



has been exposed before; we leave them to examine some concrete examples of revolution according to Mr. Drysdale.

"The Ulster Unionists. The Conscientious Objectors"—(this latter is, of course, a glaring inconsistency, seeing that Parliament made provision for them in the Act)—"The gentlemen who refused the use of the Albert Hall for a labour demonstration, together with the electricians who retorted with the threat to cut off the light. The Firemen's and Seamen's Union when they refused to carry pacifists to Stockholm." These are Mr. Drysdale's examples of revolution, and they lead him to the final remark—which takes away the chief factor in a revolution—"but it is a truism of revolution, especially in Great Britain, that its characteristic mark is minority."

Mr. Drysdale objects to these revolutionaries of his imagination because they neglect the constitutional weapon and employ, or threaten to employ, force. But although the employment of force may be necessary to effect a revolution, something else is equally necessary. In the first place, the force at the disposal of his fancied revolutionaries is altogether inadequate to effect their objects if the capitalist State is opposed to them. Secondly, the objects themselves are not revolutionary, consequently the actions, conduct, or threats are not, therefore, revolutionary either.

Having given instances in the present, Mr. Drysdale appeals to history to support his definition. He says:

"Majorities always use the high road; the short cut, with its risks of damage by trespass, is, as the Irish say, the contraption of the minority impatient. Both the British revolutions in the Stuart period, the great French revolution, the Russian revolution, were all minority short cuts, and whatever their net ultimate gain may be they were, and have been, attended by penalties which the majority way would have escaped."

If the Bolshevik movement is meant by Mr. Drysdale, he is mistaken in calling it a revolution, because up to the present no evidence is forthcoming to prove either that a revolution has been accomplished, or that the workers of Russia have a revolutionary object. All the evidence so far goes to prove the contrary.

With regard to the English revolution of the Stuart period, the evidence is complete and convincing to those who read history. The fore-runners of the modern capitalist class took no short cuts. Their fight against feudalism and monarchy extended over several centuries, and was only victorious when they made themselves masters of the political machine, and consequently the paymasters and directors of the Parliamentary forces.

The French revolution is, if possible, an even better example of the stupendous forces that have to be developed before a social revolution is accomplished. In his "History of the French Revolution" H. Morse Stephens shows that for nearly a century the bourgeoisie of France were planting the seeds, educating and organising for the day when they should, through the "States General," gain their victory over monarchy and feudalism.

Changes of dynasty, monarchs, or even the abolition of monarchies and the establishment of republics merely amount to changes of rulers. Only such great social changes as from feudalism to capitalism can be correctly termed revolutions. Transformations that affect society from top to bottom, that, in short, change the fundamental principles that form the basis of society. Such changes as these cannot be effected by short cuts or coups; they rely for their success upon the conscious action of an entire class. A long process of evolution in the means of production causes incongruities in the apportionment of burdens or in the distribution of wealth. The class that suffers can only find relief by intelligent and conscious action, directed toward the establishment of relations in harmony with the changed means and methods of production.

The working class to-day suffer poverty in the midst of plenty, because the means of life are owned by a class in society, production being based on the commodity character of human labour-power. The working class can only reap the advantage of the new methods of production when they establish a system where the means of life are owned in common and the commodity character of labour-power is abolished.

Mr. Drysdale falls into a fresh error when he imagines that the opposing interests of the two classes in society can be reconciled, and such a revolution rendered unnecessary. In a future article his suggestions will be examined.

F. F.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.  
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

#### CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Please note that the Head Office address is now:

17, MOUNT PLEASANT,  
LONDON, W.C.1.,

where all communications should be sent.

#### BY THE WAY.

It is just possible that, by the time this issue of our journal is ready for sale, the opposing sections of the capitalist class who, for close on five years, have been urging their dupes to slaughter, will have temporarily patched up THEIR quarrel.

The fact that there are, as Mr. Bonar Law has told us, twenty-three minor wars on hand, does not matter to those who are making the world safe for democracy. At long last the cry "Give peace in our time, O Lord," has been heard, and "our greatest enemy" is crushed. We are now bidden to hang out our flags and rejoice. For what should we rejoice? Is it the knowledge that millions of the world's working class have been done to death and thousands upon thousands more rendered mental and physical wrecks, not forgetting the widows and orphans, in order to satiate capitalist greed, that we are now exhorted to rejoice and be glad?

How mechanical it all is! In the beginning the capitalist class inform us, the working class, through their Press, that we have an enemy "over there." We are told to hate him; tall stories are written in order to infuriate us and work us up into a warlike attitude; and when our liberty-loving masters cry "halt!" we obey. And last of all they arrange peace concert parties for us. How stupid! Think it over, fellow wage slaves.

In perusing some of the peace prattle I came across the following morsel which beautifully illustrates our masters' way of doing things, and proves incidentally beyond all disputation, that the noble ideal which has actuated the Allies from the very beginning down to the present time, namely, the crushing, root and branch, of militarism, has been worthily maintained. Here it is:

The German plenipotentiaries will arrive through the park, and military honours will not be accorded them on their entry, but they will leave at the same time as the Allied plenipotentiaries, and, being no longer enemy delegates, will receive military honours.  
—Reuter Special.

Blimey! I can almost imagine Lloyd George and Wilson leading the singing at some peace concert. Such songs as "For Old Times' Sake" and "We'll All Go the Same Way Home" would be most appropriate.

Just recently the big-wigs of the Empire's capital—the representatives of the holy trinity of Rent, Interest, and Profit—assembled for the purpose of bestowing the freedom of the City

of London on "those two heroes of the war," Admiral Beatty and Field Marshal Haig.

Arising out of this little jollification there are just two points to which I desire to draw attention. First, it does seem somewhat incongruous that the claims of the men who have been fighting for the Allied section of the capitalist class should require to be incessantly placed before whose whose interests they have been so well serving. Why is it that our capitalist masters so soon forget their faithful warriors when the last shot has been fired? In the din of battle "we are one"; there is the "new spirit of comradeship" which was generated in the trenches or on the man-of-war; but with the cessation of hostilities the curtain is rung down on all the flowery talk, and once again the players return to the old game of scrambling for jobs—that phenomenon peculiar to capitalist society.

Here we see the antagonism of interests between the working and the employing classes. We may have been "over there," facing the "enemy," but coming back to the ordinary work-a-day world we suffer no delusion. Even the agents of capitalism are themselves occasionally forced to step in and, as it were, "pour oil on troubled waters," or remind the employing class that they have certain "obligations" to the men who have kept the flag flying, which should be honoured. This brings me to the burden of Admiral Beatty's speech, from which I quote the following:

I should like to express here the hope that in the revival of commerce, employers will consider the claim of ex-naval officers. Their inevitable lack of experience is, I understand, proving an obstacle to their finding employment. They have, however, invaluable qualities of resource, loyalty, discipline, and experience in handling men, which make them peculiarly fitted for many of the positions that have to be filled.  
—"Daily News," June 13th, 1919.

In the event of the Admiral's hope not coming to maturity, well, of course, the men can form part of the new "voluntary" armed force. The posters recently exhibited state: "If you are out of work call at the recruiting office." An empty stomach is a good recruiting sergeant.

The second point arises from the contribution of Sir Douglas Haig. Notwithstanding the innumerable occasions on which we have been told that this war was to end war, and that we were fighting militarism, we have this warrior bold asserting at the very time "we" are insisting that the Germans must limit their military forces to 100,000 men, that what we want is more militarism. According to a report of his speech I find he delivered himself as followeth:

My message to you, and through you to the Empire,



is to urge you, now that the war has given you at once the reason and the opportunity to do so, to set up forthwith the organisation of a strong citizen army on Territorial lines—an organisation which shall ensure that every able-bodied citizen shall come forward when the next crisis comes, not as a willing, patriotic, but militarily ignorant volunteer, but as a trained man.

Yea, verily, I ask what it shall profit you if, having dethroned militarism in Germany it is enthroned in England? Thousands of men have laid down their lives believing that in doing so they were helping to eradicate the evil of militarism. Surely they have died in vain if ear is given to these people of whom Sir Douglas Haig is the chief mouthpiece.

Our speaker revels in his subject. To make sure that none shall slip through the meshes he says later on—

There must, in addition, be our highly trained professional army to maintain the standard of our military knowledge, and meet the daily needs of a police force for our vast Empire, and there must be proper and sufficient training schools and staff colleges that the higher arts of war may be kept abreast of the times. Above all, however, to ensure that the military strength of our race may be readily realisable to meet whatever danger may threaten us we need to organise at once our democratic citizen army.

This is what capitalism holds in store for the workers who blindly support this hellish system. Arise, then; remove the blinkers from your eyes, and help to fight for

#### THE WORLD FOR THE WORKERS.

Though we were told that the Germans initiated the war in the air, and it was a violation of international law, the Allies seem quite content to extend its usage. For colossal hypocrisy the Allies take some beating. Now for a quotation on a recent air excursion—

#### BOMBS ON AMIR'S PALACE.

A telegram received from Simla reporting the air attacks on Jalalabad, according to a Reuter message, says that these bombing raids have been highly successful. In a night raid Captain Carbery dropped four small bombs on the Amir's Palace. In a day raid four bombs were dropped amongst 2,000 infantry on parade, inflicting about 50 casualties. The infantry scattered into the barracks, which were bombed in the next raid. Six direct hits were obtained, and all the bombs were dropped in the town, which was much damaged. Fifteen machines took part in the raid and nearly two tons of bombs were dropped.—“Daily News,” 28.5.1919.

We live in a strange world. The Government's appeal for money by the 4 per cent. Funding Loan and the 4 per cent. Victory Bonds does not in any way excite us. But we have some difficulty in understanding why the “Daily Herald” accepts these advertisements and prints them in its columns—whether paid

or not does not matter—rails continuously at the Government, and claims to be voicing the views of the revolutionary working class. Is this the class-conscious action that paper frequently speaks of day by day? Surely by issuing such an appeal our contemporary is assisting the master class to carry on, to further entrench themselves, to keep their hold upon the workers, and above all, assisting in spreading confusion amongst the workers by such anti working-class action?

Though we frequently hear the Psalm-singing fraternity giving lip to the hymn “We are not divided, all one body we,” the truth of their contention is gravely open to doubt, as witness the following:

The Church of England is so divided that many excellent churchmen have turned away in despair from any further effort to recover external unity.—Bishop of Hereford at Westminster.

THE SCOUT.

#### THE ART OF GETTING ON.

There are two comments on the present economic system, by H. de Vere Stackpoole in his book “The Children of the Sea” which deserve consideration and criticism from a Socialist's point of view. Let us see what he says.

On page 106 we read that he “has noticed that the men who get on in life are not the men who work, but the men who make others work for them.”

Exactly! Under the present system of production—which is simply production for profit—the one idea of the profit-mongers is to amass wealth by using the workers as their wealth producers, at the same time abstaining from labour themselves. The lot of the workers is to toil for the class that own the essential means of life. The working class, being landless and propertyless, are dispossessed of the basic means of wealth production, therefore they are completely at the mercy of the master class, and are compelled to accept the conditions imposed on them by their exploiters.

All the wealth in the world has been, and is, made by the workers, and all the marvellous wealth-producing machinery also. Yet the capitalist class appropriate all that is produced by their wage slaves, paying them back in wages only sufficient in the long run to maintain themselves and their families as efficient wealth-producers, and to reproduce their own class as potential wage slaves for the future benefit of the capitalist class.

This fact is abundantly proved by the fact that the workers as a class live and die in poverty.

“The men who work,” as a general rule, do not “get on in life.” They are so occupied with their enforced task of getting on with the work that produces their masters' profits that they do not live, in the real sense, at all: they only exist as profit-making machines. They sell their labour-power, their very vitality, daily; men and women and children, under the present system, have to sell themselves as commodities in the labour market in the same way as other commodities, like matches or margarine, are sold in the commercial market.

And the capitalists live only by their robbery of the working class. Vampire-like, they are sustained only by sapping the energy and life of their wage slaves.

In consequence dire misfortune is the toilers' lot, e.g., unemployment, care and anxiety, want, overwork, disease, and premature death—all arising from the wages system.

The functions of the master class—the men who get on in life—are to rob the workers of the greater part of the wealth alone produced by the latter, to devise all kinds of cunning schemes to increase the exploitation of the workers, and at the same time to delude them as to their real interests, and make them docile, contented, and industrious.

The political machine being completely controlled by the capitalist class, all legislation is, naturally, for their interests alone, and directed toward their continued dominance. As a class they thus get stronger and stronger, possessing the twin powers of political supremacy and the fundamental means of life.

The rich thus grow richer and the poor ever poorer in relation.

Yes, the art of “getting on” is that of making others work for one, and to use wealth for the purpose of further robbing the only class producing it: the working class.

Now for a consideration of Mr. Stackpoole's other comment. On page 198 we read—

“In this little, tiny industry you might have observed the fact, ignored by trade unions and labour leaders the world over, that success in business is not born of men, but of a man, that the outcome of the fight between business and business, like the fight between battleship and battleship, rests on the tactics developed by a single mind.”

What is success in business but a victory in “the fight between business and business”—the driving of competitors from the market; buying labour-power as cheaply as possible with the one idea of extracting from its activities as much surplus-value, or profit, as one can?

“Success in business” is often the result of

utter unscrupulousness, cunning, and astute “twisting.” Fraud, misrepresentation, and the quintessence of greed and exploitation are frequently the allies of “sound business methods.” Underselling, “rigging” the markets, raising false mercantile reports, and “cornering”—these are some of the “tactics developed by a single mind” as phrased by Mr. Stackpoole.

But surely he does not consider that the successful business man is so perfectly self-sufficient and “brainy” that he is independent of the contributory help of others?

Let us deal with actuality. As a class the capitalists do nothing at all toward actual production. The great capitalists generally employ men to be organisers and overseers, exploiting their initiative, push, directive ability, and hustle in order to obtain the utmost amount of productivity from the labour-power embodied in the bodies and minds of the exploited wage slaves.

The capitalist and “big business man” is not the great god Mr. Stackpoole supposes him to be. If predatory instincts and a fully-developed avaricious and scheming nature are prime virtues, then the capitalists, as a class, are the embodiment of sterling worth.

The truth is that no man stands alone; no man is absolutely independent of society, or not indebted to the accumulated advantages and knowledge long since derived—the result of the historical development of society. Heredity and environment, experience and the utilisation of ideas and suggestions from all kinds of sources, all these things go to secure a superior position in the fight for business supremacy. The gifts and their development are the outcome of social environment.

The invention of a labour-saving device often results in the actual inventor having to sell his invention because he cannot afford to patent it. Or it may be infringed upon, or perhaps his idea may be brazenly stolen. The workers (usually considered by their exploiters as mere mechanical “hands”), being practical men, do the inventing, and generally speaking, the capitalist class reap the fruits of the former's creative ability and industry.

Instances innumerable can be cited to prove the parasitic and thievish nature of our exploiters. These “merchant princes,” these “captains of industry,” of what social use are they? What is their function but to exploit? Generally they have not brains enough to do that efficiently, but depend on their hirelings to superintend and organise, while they themselves are immune from the necessity of working even for a single day's bread. Their thieves' opulence enables them to waste untold wealth in every way.



Shameless vampires! they have yet the effrontery to claim that "success in business" is the outcome of their own "directive ability."

If Mr. Stackpoole harbours any hazy economic opinions and pro-capitalist ideas, let him rid himself of them by studying the facts of capitalist production and its results, and understanding the fundamental truths of Marxian economics. Part truth and part falsity, like oil and water, will not mix. When half-truths go the truth arrives.

In conclusion, let me ask Mr. Stackpoole one question. He is a successful author. Let him think deeply. Does he understand the debt he owes to the writers of the past and present, and what he owes to favourable circumstances that have made him what he is, and also the advantages that are his through his position in contemporary society?

Let Mr. Stackpoole think over this, and he will begin to understand that, in a very real sense, the term "a self-made man" is a misnomer. As regards Commerce and Industry, he will also understand that, under a ruthless, sordid system like the present, one man's gain is often achieved at the price of many men's loss! and that the "tactics developed by a single mind" are often sought, bought, and paid for by the very worst enemies of society as we know it to day—the unscrupulous, plundering capitalist class—who do not hesitate to plunge the world into a colossal war when their interests demand it.

To them, in "peace" or in war," no sacrifice (of the workers' lives) is too great when capitalist interests are at stake

GRAHAM MAY.

#### BOBBY BRIBED.

Bobby Bluebottle, then, is to receive £3 10s. a week and upwards, with other advantages. The news comes as a bit of a surprise. It shows that the master class got a nasty jolt when they found their bull-dogs organising with the other workers. Therefore, having tried bullying with indifferent result, they now resort to bribery.

It says a great deal for the work our bosses expect to call upon the police perform, that they should offer them such money. Taking this in conjunction with their recent attempt to find out how far the soldiers were prepared to deal strikers, it gives warning we will do well to heed. Be prepared. J.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

## PAST CLASS STRUGGLES

### THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

During the 15th century the minds of the merchants in the rising European commercial States were agitated by the attempts to discover another way to the East Indies, for the customary caravan routes across the Continent of Asia were threatened, and in some cases completely blocked, by the growth of Arabian and Moorish power. Portugal, through Diaz and da Gama, tried round the Southern part of Africa, while Spain sent Columbus across the Western waters.

Columbus eventually reached America, and the land he discovered is thus described by Prescott (Prescott's Works, edited by John Foster Kirk) in his "Biographical and Critical Miscellanies":

All around was free,—free as Nature herself: the mighty streams rolling on in their majesty, as they had continued to roll from the creation; the forests which no hand had violated, flourishing in primeval grandeur and beauty: their only tenants the wild animals, or the Indians nearly as wild, scarcely held together by any tie of social polity. Nowhere was the trace of civilized man or his curious contrivances. . . . The only eye upon them was the eye of heaven. (Page 127)

The dealings of Columbus, the slave trader, with the natives of this virgin land is a record of fraud, cruelty, and force perpetrated on innocent, generous, and credulous savages. As the immediate pecuniary gains from his discoveries did not satisfy those who financed his expedition, Columbus frequently offered to send to Spain cargoes of the natives to be sold into slavery.

The colonists who followed in the track of Columbus were Court adventurers and companies of merchants, who were granted tracts of land with almost unlimited rights of settlement, being empowered to make their own laws, etc. The settlements were originally on the Eastern coast, but could be extended, if desired in strips right across the continent to the Pacific coast.

From the beginning the attitude of the colonists toward the innocent savages was one of cruelty and rapine, as the following quotation will bear out (in Reference to Rayleigh's settlement on Roanoke Island, N. Carolina, 1585):

Treachery and cruelty, however, marked the brief existence of even this first English colony; a leading Indian chief and his principle followers were massacred by pre-concert at an audience at which no sign of hostility was shown by the Indians.—"War of American Independence," Ludlow, p. 27.

As the new land was opened up the settler commenced to do a roaring trade with the mother country, and the need for workers arose

"Voluntary emigration ceased in 1685, and the only additions from England to the white population were by means of transportation and kidnapping, the latter practised chiefly from Bristol." (Ludlow, p. 31.) "Kidnappers as well as slave buyers, the colonists broke the treaties with the Indians, harried them with commandoes, and sold them as slaves to the West Indies." (Ludlow, p. 36.)

The history of America up to the period of the Revolution is the record of the rise to enormous wealth of a land-owning, slave-holding, and trading autocracy. The property qualification excluded the workers from the vote (and the same was true long after the Revolution), all wealth and power being in the hands of the wealthy class.

During this time there were frequent revolts of the oppressed, all of which were ruthlessly suppressed by the future advocates of eternal liberty.

The enclosure of the common lands in France, Germany, and England gave rise to a multitude of starving outcasts, some of whom turned their eyes toward the New World in the hope of finding an amelioration of their lot. These provided ready material for the kidnapper and emigration agent, who enticed them across the Atlantic and then sold them into a species of slavery (indentured service) even worse than the slavery of the blacks.

The records of the American white slave traffic exhibit an almost unbelievable barbarity. This traffic is fully discussed by James O'Neal in "The Workers in American History," where the worst evils of Negro slavery are shown to be paralleled if not surpassed by the system of indentured service.

Of course, the followers of the "meek and lowly one" had to have a finger in the pie, and we read that—

The famous Whitfield, and the two Wesleys, visited America at this period (1743) and urged the expediency of allowing slavery. (Ludlow, p. 38.)

In his "Story of the Negro" Booker F. Washington points out that the white man sold his own people in America years before the first black slaver sailed into Jamestown, Virginia (1619).

These, then, were the conditions from which the wealth of America had arisen.

When the English capitalists realised what a prize was within their grasp they tried to keep their hands upon it, and in doing so, overreached themselves. Navigation laws were passed confining to English vessels, navigation by Englishmen, all importation into and exportation from the colonies, and even forbidding any importation of European commodities

except those commodities coming from England.

Subsequently a further Act was passed forbidding all colonial staples to be imported otherwise than to England, so that a duty equivalent to the English customs duty was laid on the importation of such articles from one colony to another. Says Gibbins:

It is quite obvious, apart from any consideration of national policy, these regulations were dictated by the class interests of British manufacturers and merchants. ("Industry in England," p. 366.)

All these restrictions, however, failed in their object. An extensive contraband trade developed and American smugglers waxed wealthy.

It was the time when the great inventions were revolutionising industry in England. The production of wealth in prodigious quantities was commencing, and the world lay waiting to absorb all the English manufacturers could produce. So we can guess with what consternation they viewed the attempt of the Americans to produce and export on their own account, instead of remaining producers of raw material for English manufacturers and a dumping-ground for British manufactures.

The revolution commenced with some skirmishes in Boston and the upsetting of the East India Company's tea in Boston harbour. For some time this vast company was on the verge of ruin owing to the large stocks of tea and other Indian goods on their hands. The English Government magnanimously (!) agreed to accommodate the Company by taking off as much duty in England as would make the Company's tea cheaper in America than any foreigners could import. This struck a mortal blow at the smugglers. The latter were consequently roused to righteous and indignant action, and stood right sturdily for the "Rights of Man" by throwing the pernicious tea into the Atlantic.

Washington, one of the principle figures in the Revolution, prior thereto was engaged in surveying land, and O'Neal states that on the eve of the war a case was pending against him for illegal surveying. He was also deeply involved in the white slave traffic. His "poverty" may be estimated from the fact that he offered to raise and equip at his own expense a force of 1,000 men to relieve Boston.

Benjamin Franklin also was not above turning a honest penny in the slave traffic.

The delegates who had been chosen for the Philadelphia Congress of 1774 "Had known what it was to breakfast in a villa on the Hudson River with a very large silver coffee pot, a very large silver tea pot, napkins of the finest materials, plates full of choice fruit, and toast and bread and butter in great perfection. But in Philadelphia . . . there was magnificence, and, above all, abundance, under many roofs.



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	rs. 6d.
Six .. .. .	9d

## The Socialist Standard,

TUESDAY,



JULY 1, 1919.

## SCAPA FLOW.

The comic element for the month has undoubtedly been supplied by the scuttling of the interned German fleet at Scapa Flow. One's first thoughts, naturally, upon hearing the news, were to congratulate the naval authorities upon the arrangements they had made for the safe-keeping of the "enemy" ships. It seemed so child like to leave the vessels in the hands of German crews, under the command of German officers, without any sort of a guard on board—so like the simple sailor of tradition!

But the simple sailor won't have it. He with eager promptitude reminds the world at large that he never had the opportunity of preventing the scuttling, that the German war-ships were not surrendered, but interned, and as such had certain rights under international law which precluded the proper safe-guarding of them, and he throws the blame on the statesmen who failed to secure the surrender instead of the internment of the "enemy" fleet.

The incident and its sequel reveals again the sordid reality behind the mask of undying and fervid loyalty with which the Allies have endeavoured to hide their countenances. Must as, all through the war, or at least until their prospects of getting licked properly "put the wind up 'em," the Allied nations have been grasping each at its own coveted share of the spoils, striving to occupy "enemy" territory on the principle that possession is nine points of the international law, and because they could not trust each other, in spite of all the secret treaties—secret because they were too foul with filthy

trafficking to stand the light of day—so they could not trust each other with the German ships. All the talk of the "honour of our gallant Allies" has been so much tosh. They have known each other for the thieves they are, and that is why they choose rather to trust the German fleet to German crews than have them surrendered, with the prospect that those to whom they were surrendered might find it too painful to part with them again.

And that is why the German ships lie at the bottom of the ocean.

## PEACE—AND AGAIN WAR.

As we always said they would, our masters, who gave us war in 1914 without in any way consulting the wishes of the people, have given us "peace" in their own good time in an equally nonchalant manner. They have made no pretence of consulting the workers, though that, of course, need not prevent them claiming that they have done so. But one thing needs to have special attention drawn to it.

Already our insolent and arrogant masters have booked up our lives for a fresh war. In 1914 they told us that the country was bound by no pledge, which proved to be a damned lie, but, in the triumph of their militarism, they make no bones about the business this time. They resort to no subterfuge: the workers, drunk with their masters' victory, are not of sufficient importance to be deceived in the matter. All that they have to do is to jubilate over the fact that the signing of the Peace Treaty sets their masters free to proceed with their exploitation on lines dictated by the condition of things.

But there it is. If the reports of the capitalist Press prove correct, our democratic bosses have made the engagement, over and above the heads of the people, and when the time comes will call upon them to honour the pact, in the making of which they have not been consulted, and have taken no part, and to which they can therefore owe no allegiance.

But there is another aspect of the case. What becomes of the "League of Nations"? Is this pact an admission that the "League" is a mere phantasm, a spineless, parchment entity which can have no power or influence in the real world—the world of strife for economic interests? Is it a recognition that when the next great struggle for commercial supremacy takes place the "League of Nations" will "bust up" into two opposing sections, according to those economic interests, and is it, therefore, indicative of the future stand of France, Greater Britain, and America against the world, and hence an attempt to secure commercial supremacy for these?

## NEWS AND VIEWS ABOUT RUSSIA.

"SIX WEEKS IN RUSSIA IN 1919," by ARTHUR RANSOME. Paper, 2s. 6d. I.L.P., S.L.P., and George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

This interesting work by an observer who has recently returned from Russia consists of a series of short sketches descriptive of the situation there during February and part of March this year.

The position of our Party in relation to the Russian insurrection receives in this book a good deal of justification. Much of the work consists of interesting though brief accounts of the personalities of prominent characters in the revolt, and their opinions upon various phases of the situation confronting them.

The industrial difficulties which face the Bolsheviks are dealt with, but so also are the valliant efforts being made to overcome them. Railways and roads are under construction; the Baltic-Volga canal system has been improved to admit the movement of large ships; power-stations on a peat fuel basis are in process of building, and improvements in textile production have been made enabling the utilisation of the abundant supply of flax which is available. There is a great shortage of transport, fuel, and food, but the last two items have become more plentiful since the acquisition of the Ukrainian supplies.

In the control of industrial establishments technical and managing experts are appointed by a central authority instead of being, as formerly, elected by workers in the concern—an important modification.

The most important problem in Russia is, however, that of agriculture, and this is, unfortunately, all too briefly dealt with. One thing is made clear—the utter impossibility of land socialisation for a long period to come is now recognised by the Soviet Government. Let us quote Ransome:

In the afternoon I met Sereda, the Commissar of Agriculture. He insisted that their agrarian policy had been much misrepresented by their enemies for the purpose of agitation. *They had no intention of any such idiocy as the attempt to force the peasants to give up private ownership.* The establishment of communes was not to be compulsory in any way; it was to be an illustrative means of propaganda of the idea of communal work, not more. The main task before them was to raise the standard of Russian agriculture, which under the old system was extremely low. By working many of the old estates on a communal system with the best possible methods they hoped to do two things at once: to teach the peasant to realise the advantage of communal labour, and to show him that he could himself get a very great deal more out of his land than he does. "In other ways also we are doing everything we can to give direct help to the small agriculturists."

We have mobilised all the agricultural experts of the country. We are issuing a mass of simply written pamphlets explaining better methods of farming." (Page 99-100. *Italics mine.*)

According to some of our critics the Russian moujik needs neither force nor persuasion to acquiesce in the socialisation of the land, but those in Russia know different. Philip Price in his pamphlet "Capitalist Europe and Socialist Russia," tells us that: "the decree on land, issued by the Bolshevik Council of the People's Commissaries, instantly quieted the peasants. They knew that the land would indeed be theirs if the land committees, which they controlled, had the handling of it." But, we may add, "theirs" in a different sense from that the Bolsheviks intended, for on January 23rd, 1918, they passed the new land law which declared, according to Price, "*All private property in land, minerals, water, forests, and the forces of Nature within the limits of the Republic are abolished for ever, and 'the land without any compensation to the owners (open or hidden) becomes the property of the whole people to be used for objects of common utility.*" (*Italics mine.*)

How does this decree square with the statement of Sereda as to the non-interference with private peasant property? This is one instance of what Ransome in more than one place refers to, namely, that many of the fine sounding Soviet decrees exist largely or wholly on paper owing to the difficulty of enforcing them: "the spirit is willing" but the materials are damned rotten.

Does not the idea of model communes and propaganda pamphlets remind us of the work of Owen, Cabet, and the other Utopians who hoped to banish capitalism by "good examples"; by demonstrating the "superiority" of communism with "model factories" and co-operative colonies. Of course the conditions are vastly different, for the experiments in Russia are undertaken with the assistance of the State authority, but even so, to convince tens of millions of semi-barbarian, grossly superstitious, illiterate and intensely conservative peasants by such means is a colossal, an insuperable, task.

Ransome reports the continuation of his conversation:

I told Sereda I had heard that the peasants were refusing to sow more than they wanted for their own needs. He said that on the contrary the latest reports gave them the right to hope for a greater sown area this year than ever before, and that even more would have been sown if Denmark had not been prevented from letting them have the seed for which they had actually paid. I put the same question to him that I put to Nogin as to what they most needed; he replied "Tractors." (Page 100.)

The first part of Sereda's statement looks like an exaggeration. It probably means more has



been sown than during the past four years, which should be pretty obvious seeing that the millions of peasants drawn from production for the Imperial army completely disorganised agriculture and almost brought it to a standstill. But if Sereda means literally what he says: "more than ever before," this would not be surprising, for after centuries of impoverishment both in land and products, the poorer peasants would indeed be fools if they did not use to the full their present opportunity to raise their level of subsistence.

But really Sereda's evasive reply does not settle Ransome's pertinent query at all. The point is, can the Soviet Government assure a constant and automatic supply of agricultural products as food and raw material whilst retaining the system of peasant farming and, at the same time, socialising the industries of the towns?

Sereda's last point is significant—"Tractors." Without machinery, and the consequent abolition of the primitive, individually used tools of production true socialisation is impossible. The manufacture or importation of agricultural machinery in sufficient quantities and its practical use embodying the destruction of the traditional mode of production and social relations in Russian rural life is the only solution—and this will take years to accomplish.

In an account of a conversation with Lenin Ransome says:

We talked then of the antipathy of the peasants to compulsory Communism, and how that idea had also considerably whittled away. I asked him what were going to be the relations between the Communists of the towns and the property-loving peasants, and whether there was not great danger of antipathy between them, and said I regretted leaving too soon to see the elasticity of the Communist theories tested by the inevitable pressure of the peasantry.

Lenin said that in Russia there was a pretty sharp distinction between the rich peasants and the poor. "The only opposition we have here in Russia is directly or indirectly due to the rich peasants. The poor, as soon as they are liberated from the political domination of the rich, are on our side and are in an enormous majority." I said that would not be so in the Ukraine, where property among the peasants is much more evenly distributed. (Lenin.) "No. And there, in the Ukraine, you will certainly see our policy modified. Civil war, whatever happens, is likely to be more bitter in the Ukraine than elsewhere, because there the instinct of property has been further developed in the peasantry, and the minority and majority will be more equal. (Pp. 150-151.)

Now, without pretending to any detailed knowledge of the situation, is not the support of the poor and the opposition of the rich peasantry due to the fact that the Bolsheviks support the aspirations of the poor peasants for larger allotments even at the expense of the richer peasants, and that the latter are prevented

from employing wage labourers and thus cultivating and making a profit upon whatever surplus land was left them, in addition to having to bear a heavy taxation? The support of the poor peasants does not mean that they are in favour of land socialisation, but that they have received land from the Soviet regime which was hitherto denied them, as well as backing against their would-be exploiters.

It has been repeatedly stated in this journal that the Bolsheviks do not draw their power from a class-conscious working class. The above bears evidence of that, but Mr. Ransome's book contains even more definite information on the point. He states that the discontent engendered by hunger and cold was so great and widespread, though unorganised, that the non-Bolshevik parties could, were they not afraid of reactionary invasion, use it with such effect as to overthrow the Communist party. Now were the workers conscious supporters of Communism it is obvious that they would easily recognise their impoverishment to be due to causes outside the control of any political party, and that neither the Social Democratic reformers nor the Socialist Revolutionary Anarchists can materially alleviate their hardship. The evidence, on the contrary, shows that the Bolsheviks have proved far better organisers politically and economically than any of their predecessors in power, and that whatever improvement has occurred is, in a measure, due to them.

Most of the Bolshevik leaders seem to think that England is on the verge of a Socialist revolution, and Lenin in an amusing sentence quoted by Ransome declared that "Ramsay MacDonald will try to [stop it] at the last minute." We here, however, know only too painfully how mistaken the Russian revolutionaries are. Let those who think it possible for a minority of workers here to seize political power in the way the Bolsheviks successfully adopted in Russia, ponder over the words of Meshtcherikov, quoted by Mr. Ransome on page 58 of his book. This old Siberian exile, who has recently visited England, says:

In the West, if there is revolution, they will use artillery at once, and wipe out whole districts. The governing classes in the West are determined and organised in a way our home-grown capitalists never were. The autocracy never allowed them to organise, so, when the autocracy itself fell, our task was comparatively easy. There was nothing in the way. It will not be like that in Germany.

The suppression and massacre of the Spartacists in Berlin, Munich, and elsewhere in Germany proved this judgment correct.

Let the revolutionary workers of this country continue their urgent task of agitation, education, and organisation for the day when, having

full control of the armed forces of society through the only source of that power—the State machinery—they will be enabled to handle in no uncertain fashion the pro-slavery revolt of the present ruling parasites and their allies, and proceed with the only method of proletarian emancipation, the ownership and control by the community of the means of life.

R. W. HOUSLEY.

## INTOLERANCE.

The charge is often levelled against Socialists that they are "intolerant." It is said that they are not prepared to find excuses for anybody or anything and that they are bigoted to the exclusion even of justice. If it is meant that Socialists are not tolerant of society the label is justified; but our detractors do not mean that alone.

They go on to say that we let our distaste for society manifest itself in every personal action. That, perhaps, is again true up to a certain point. A Socialist should not allow any occurrence to pass without applying to it his Socialist reasoning. Thus it follows that a Socialist must place a different construction from the ordinary man on the majority of things that occur in the daily life of the world. To take one instance, a man might object to a strike in any particular industry because it affects his personal comfort. He knows nothing of the economic war, of the laws which govern capitalist society and produce strikes and "industrial unrest." But the Socialist, though his personal comfort may also be affected adversely, is forced by reason of his knowledge of the forces that work in society, to take up a different attitude. Therefore, since at present the great majority of mankind is not Socialist, it follows that the views of a Socialist must be unpopular views. And since there is precious little that happens to-day that a class-conscious worker could condone or approve of, he earns from his fellows the epithet "intolerant."

When a jingo fanatic on the eve of war assassinated Jaures and was placed on trial he was acquitted, but when a young Anarchist shot at—and failed to kill—Clemenceau, whom he considered the enemy of the working class, he was sentenced to death. Surely this could be called intolerance? Again, all the obstacles that the capitalist class place in the way of the advancement of the proletariat towards their emancipation, all the slime and mud that they cast at advanced thinkers, all the ridicule that they attempt to heap on Socialist thought, indicate that they are intolerant also. It therefore appears that the Socialist and the capitalist are intolerant of one another. This leaves only the

worker who is not class-conscious, tolerant. And what does his tolerance do for him?

It makes him accept his slavery, degradation and insecurity of livelihood almost without a murmur. It reconciles him to slums, bad food, and a monotonous life relieved by no real pleasure, and burdened with sorrow. It blinds him to his sordid environment and makes him deaf to his children's cries. It keeps him docile and makes him willing to produce wealth that his masters shall enjoy, stultifies his imagination of what life should be like, and stifles his desire to improve his condition.

Thus it is only intolerance that will serve the turn of the working class. Not only the intolerance that disgruntles, but the intolerance that makes one long to be up and doing something to make things tolerable.

Until the working class decide upon intolerance, therefore, they will not better their slave condition. When they do achieve intolerance they will not be far from achieving as well their emancipation.

S. H. S.

## TWO PAGES OF S.L.P. HISTORY.

In the June issue of the "Socialist" appears an amusing little skit, the most amusing part of which, however, is the sequel which lack of space compelled our contemporary to leave out. Fortunately, however, we have an odd corner in which to complete the tale.

Three "boozy-looking demobilised scroungers" were leaning against the bar bragging of what they had done in the war, when Mr. Dan Dusty, a well-known member of our contemporary's editorial staff, got the pip, and opened his mouth and spake thusly:

"You're all three heroes, right enough; that's what you want to show, ain't it? You've all been out in France, dressed up by the capitalists . . . to fight for their interests and spoil yer own. Ain't that clever! . . . Equal to the glory of Julius Caesar, I calls it. Got about as much sense as a blooming coolie what claps his pretty little black hands for joy because his master ain't quite flogged him to death. . . . You're demobilised with a quid or two or buried in yer khaki, just as you was so gloriously shot by the other working man, labeled German, as big a fool as you. . . ."

And this is what, but for us would have been lost to the world:

Beeriest-looking Scrounger: "Yus, matey, we're dam fools, and no mistake about it. But its like, your dam cheek to say so, seeing that we only joined up because YOUR paper told us we ought to do so—here, don't go."

A. E. J.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

## DO WORKING-CLASS CONDITIONS TEND TO GROW WORSE?

TO THE EDITOR.

Dear Sir,—The readers of your paper frequently let upon the statement that the "condition of the working class tends to grow worse," but one looks in vain for verification of the statement.

Do better houses and rapid transit not brighten and better the lot of those sections of the working class who take advantage of them, say, by residing in the outlying districts of the larger cities, where modern houses and domestic conveniences are so much more congenial than in the slums of the city proper? Do not all the efforts made by local and national authorities to effect improvements in health, houses, travel, industrial relationships, unemployed donations, for the working class count for nothing? Have the housing conditions of the whole working class of England improved none since the commencement of the industrial era, even in the present century? I declare they have. There may be very bad spots upon which you could possibly lay your finger, but is it a reasonable claim to make now-a-days that conditions are worse than they were twenty years ago.

It does not refute my point to say that it but amounts to gilded chains, or that it makes more efficient slaves, which answer seems to me but admissions that the conditions under which the working class live and labour are better to-day than formerly. Yet we repeatedly read in the "S.S." that the conditions of the working class tend to grow worse, also that we as a working class are worse off. We are no, and I speak as one of the workers.

Is it not also a fact the natural concomitant of economic progress is to make more efficient the workers which compel improvements in their conditions of life? Is not that a bettering of conditions rather than its reverse? And it is not always that these reforms are effected by agitation. Were the unemployment donations wrung from the capitalist class? I think they were not. Is the new Ministry of Health wrung from them? Rather is it a concession made by the capitalist class to effect a more virile and healthy race of workers—perhaps advantageous to the former in the end; still, the advantage gained by the workers disproves the repeated statement in the "S.S." that the conditions of the working class tend to grow worse.—Yours, etc., A. WEBSTER.

Our correspondent in the last part of his letter shows the absurdity of his statements in the first part. We will, however, proceed in the usual manner, taking his points one by one before dealing with his general statement as to the conditions of the whole working class.

His most preposterous claim is "improvement in Industrial Relationships." The growing antagonism and the increasing bitterness between masters and workers in every occupation and industry, because it is universal and affects the bulk of the workers, gives the lie to it. But apart from that fact there has been an accumulating mass of evidence, coming from the capitalist side, that exploitation becomes more thorough and business-like, leaving no room for

sentiment. The brutal relationship between employers and workers has for several years been a constant theme with every capitalist rag from the "Times" to "John Bull," to the tune of "never again"; and the outcome has been "Whitley Councils" and "Welfare Committees" that have aroused the suspicion of the workers, and are in bad odour with them everywhere.

The nature of modern industry makes unemployed donations a necessity to the exploiting class. In the first place capitalist production requires an army of unemployed to keep down wages, and that unemployed army must be maintained. In the second place trade is subject to fluctuations in volume, and the workers must be available when it is necessary to increase production. The problem for the exploiting class is, therefore, to maintain the unemployed at a standard that will not seriously impair their efficiency, while, at the same time, it places them under the necessity of seeking work. This is effected by the present system of granting donations for a limited number of weeks in each year. The donation not being sufficient in itself to satisfy the barest requirements, and being immediately stopped if the recipient refuses work, it is easily seen that the whole scheme is a cheap method of maintaining the unemployed army for the contingencies of trade and as a weapon to keep down wages.

In his remarks on housing our correspondent is most unfortunate. Overcrowding is worse now than it has been throughout all the twenty years he mentions. So much is this admitted that the subject takes first place among all the scandals on everybody's tongue to-day.

Addressing a conference at Nottingham on the 16th June, Dr. Addison, President of the Local Government Board, said: "In vast numbers of our industrial centres people were now being compelled, through shortage of houses, to herd together in a manner it was disgusting to think of."

One of the most significant facts in connection with the proposals to build more houses for the workers is the recognition by the Government that wages are so low that it will be impossible to charge what is called an economic rent—surely in itself a powerful commentary on working-class conditions generally.

With reference to "travel," it is perfectly true that several millions of workers during the last five years have had exceptional opportunities of seeing the world, while endeavouring to annex more of it for their masters. But the majority are glad to be back in the slums and factories, with the slender facilities they had previously, paying sixpence a week toward the annual beanfeast, or denying themselves many comforts in order to spend an uncomfortable week

or so at the nearest overcrowded seaside resort.

The "rapid transit for those living in outlying districts" is also more or less of a fraud, while those depending upon it have to wait their turn in long lines, watching the vehicles come and go. Even when there are no breakdowns the time taken up in waiting and travelling is considerable, and must be regarded as an addition to the working day and consequently as shortening the time for rest and recreation. Hence it is an extremely doubtful "advantage" to live in the slums on the outskirts of large industrial towns.

There is only one other point: "the new Ministry of Health," but this, like all the others, has been replied to in the general sense by Mr. Webster himself. Economic progress, he says, demands higher efficiency, which is impossible without improved conditions. He argues that the growing efficiency of the workers is evidence of their improved conditions of life, in spite of the fact that higher efficiency is everywhere insisted upon, at the present moment, as a preliminary to improved conditions. The truth is, of course, that the workers are driven, through increasing unemployment and competition, to submit to a more intensive exploitation.

But even if we admit that the improvements he mentions have materialised, he still is up against the fact that they are introduced by the exploiting class in order to extract more surplus value from the workers—and surplus value representing more wealth than the workers consume through their improvements. While the workers submit to this process their exploitation intensifies, their slavery becomes more degrading, and their dependence on the exploiting class is increased. Exploitation is the cause of poverty and the extent of exploitation is the measure of poverty.

Fed on potatoes, the life object of the workers is to produce wealth for the master class; fed on bully beef and custard all their energies are confiscated for the same purpose. If the quality or quantity of food the worker obtains determines the amount of surplus value, its provision can safely be left to the capitalists; there is no necessity to "wring" concessions of such a character from them. The advantage to themselves is clear. It is a parallel case with the fertilizing of land to produce a better crop.

While the workers submit to exploitation they are subject to numerous experiments carried out over their heads. The continual changes in the means and methods of production call for modification in the structure of society. Confronted with new problems at each economic turn, new institutions must be devised to preserve the equilibrium of capitalist society. Our correspondent says it does not refute his points

to say that "it makes them more efficient slaves." Yet all the points raised by him are effectively replied to in that sentence. He admits as much when he says that the object of the capitalist class is "to effect a more virile and healthy race of workers," i.e., wage slaves. And their real purpose he admits when he says—"perhaps advantageous to the capitalists in the end." If the object of such "concessions" is more complete and extensive exploitation, their true nature is at once revealed as a campaign against the workers, increasing their poverty, insecurity, and wretchedness. F. F.

## THE "BOLSHIES" AGAIN.

TO THE EDITORS.

"Sirs,—the writers of your paper are certainly entertaining in their aptness for attempting to discount any display of working-class solidarity or effort to overthrow the capitalist system. With a zest that is hardly excelled by the hireling journalists of the kept Press they wontonly attack . . ." (There is a lot of this sort of thing which, since it neither hurts us nor helps our correspondent, is mere space-wasting tripe. Mr. Ward may find it acceptable to a Northern contemporary, but we have something better to fill our columns with,—Eds. "S.S.") "Your leader on Russia offers a case in point, or perhaps I should write your leader on the S.L.P."

"We are asked 'On what do the Bolshevik leaders depend for their strength? Certainly not on a class-conscious working class. To talk about the millions of Socialist books and pamphlets being printed in Russia is beside the question, since 70 per cent. of the people will need to be taught to read them. The peasantry—the backbone of the country, on whom the movement must ultimately rest—cannot understand Socialism, for in the first place they are generally illiterate and cannot have read Socialist literature; in the second place they are so isolated and have been so under official guardianship, that it is altogether unlikely that Socialist propaganda has been carried on among them. How is it possible that they can see sound reasoning in the proposal that they shall grow the food for the whole people and receive in return such few products of the factories as they have need of?'"

"This statement needs analysis. Granted that capitalism was comparatively weak in Russia, it is nevertheless perfectly obvious that class-conscious workers, albeit a minority, were responsible for the overthrow of the Bourgeois. These workers have undoubtedly taken full advantage of their unique position, and are able to record practically a complete cessation of capitalist propaganda. In the towns and to a great extent



in the provinces the newspapers, theatres, and all educational facilities have been utilised for the purpose of propagating Socialist views. Imagine, if your jaundiced vision permits, the result of a complete change of front in all our propagandist agencies in this country through Socialist seizure of the Press. We are reminded that a great percentage of the Russian people cannot read. Surely lack of ability to read does not necessarily imply lack of sufficient intelligence to grasp the simple principles of Socialism.

"Instructed orally, there is no earthly reason why the simple peasant should not realise the necessity for the obliteration of exploitation.

So far as the Bolsheviks are concerned we may safely assume that they have conducted wide-spread oral campaigns without the organised obstruction we meet with in this country.

"Regarding the land question, it would be folly to imagine that revolutionaries of the quality of our Russian comrades have not produced a workable scheme of co-operative farming as a transitional measure.

"The wise-ones of your party inform us that the peasants' wants end with their few simple tools and their boots. Ye gods! a peasant clad in boots but minus the proverbial fig leaf enters into our dreams for ever.

"The statement that no evidence exists as to an attempt to establish Socialism in Russia is probably intended to be taken as S.P. humour.

If owing to the supineness and cowardice of workers in Western Europe the international capitalists ultimately smash the Socialist Republic of Russia we may be sure that wholesale massacres of revolutionary workers will follow.

"Yours, HAROLD WARD.

\*.\*When our correspondent wrote that our statement needed analysing we expected him to proceed with the analysis. Instead of which he simply denies a few asseverations, makes a few assumptions, and treats us to a number of assertions, without troubling to provide reasons, justification, or evidence to support his remarks.

We stated that the Bolshevik leaders do not depend for their strength upon a revolutionary working CLASS; our critic declares that class-conscious workers were responsible for the overthrow of the Bourgeois—quite a different thing. Without ascribing to the statement we may pass on, for it is quite immaterial whether a minority of class-conscious workers were responsible for the overthrow of the Bourgeoisie or not. The point is, on what do they depend for their strength? Our statement on that point is what our critic should have "analysed"—he leaves it severely alone.

Mr. Ward states that the Bolsheviks have utilised all educational facilities for the purpose of propagating Socialist views. But we have

never denied that. Nevertheless we ask our critic for his evidence. There are plenty of people in this country propagating views which they fondly imagine are Socialist views, but which are in reality anti-Socialist. We challenge Mr. Ward to prove his statement.

As our correspondent says, lack of ability to read does not necessarily imply lack of sufficient intelligence to grasp the simple principles of Socialism. Who said it did? And if the illiterate were stone deaf also, the same remark would apply, but it is hard to imagine how the simple principles of Socialism could be communicated to such people.

"Instructed orally," we are next told, "there is no earthly reason why the simple peasant should not realise the necessity for the obliteration of exploitation." What a wonderful fellow is Mr. Ward for stating truths (perhaps) which get us no further. Abolition of exploitation and Socialism are not exactly synonymous. The peasant would probably conceive exploitation to be abolished under a system which secured him enough land to obtain his living upon, so that he had no need to work for a master, and an incidence of taxation such as he considered fair. This, however, is a very different thing from realising the necessity for establishing Socialism.

If Mr. Ward's statement that there is no earthly reason why the peasant should not realise the necessity for the abolition of exploitation is true (and he would be on safer ground in telling us that he knows of no reason rather than affirming non-existence dogmatically) we can, at all events, give him ample and cogent reasons why the peasant of Russia is not likely to prove an easy convert to Socialism.

Speaking generally, he has had land enough to enable him produce part of his living, but so little as to compel him to work for wages also. The ruling powers have put upon his shoulders enormous taxation, amounting in some cases to 90 per cent. of the produce of his land. To pay these taxes he has been compelled to mortgage his future labour upon terms of almost incredible brutality. So sooner or later the peasant's awful slavery has culminated in the loss of all he possessed, and commonly with him making the acquaintance of the tax-gatherer's knout.

What is likely to happen when the Socialist missionary begins to expound the "simple principles of Socialism" to these men? The sources of all their troubles, as far as they can see, have been the tax collector and the usurer. They know that, given an economic holding, that is, enough land to provide for their needs, and relieved of the incubus of the taxes, and set free from the grasp of the usurer, whose toils they are already in, they have no difficulty in

gaining their livelihood. The exploitation of the factories they could hardly understand, and could hardly be expected to be deeply interested in if they did. To talk to them of the socialisation of the means of production would be like talking astronomy to a monkey. Their own solution to their own troubles stands too near, is too clear, simple, and sure, for them to be able to see beyond it. All they want is possession of the land and freedom from crushing taxes, and so plainly would this present itself as the cure for their troubles that the Socialist propagandist would have a almost hopeless task to convert them to his views.

What could you offer the Russian peasant in the name of Socialism that he would appreciate? Education for himself?—He would not consider it worth the trouble; for his children?—He would think them better at work than wasting their time over that for which they have no use. Art?—it would be an unknown language to him. Leisure?—Ah! he could understand that, but who could convince him that (by making his land the property of the community and forcing him to surrender to the community the products of his toil, he was going to get more leisure?

It is not the man who produces sverteing for himself that you can convince of the need for Socialism (for in fact it is not necessary to him) but the man who produces nothing for himself—which is what we meant when we said that only those to whom the world is necessary can be ripe for Socialism.

This brings us to our correspondent's attempt to get a cheap sneer out of our statement that the Russian peasant's wants end with his few simple tools and his boots. But in the original text that statement followed immediately upon the reference to the products of the factories quoted by Mr. Ward, while the words which immediately follow were: "All else, practically, they produce for themselves." This context leaves no doubt as to our meaning, and shows our critic's quotation to be utterly dishonest. There is, of course, the alternative that he is a fool, but it would be uncomplimentary to assume that.

If Mr. Ward thinks that the Bolsheviks have been able, in the short time at their disposal, to find and train the scores of thousands of speakers who would be necessary to reach this vast mass of semi-barbarian humanity, scattered in tiny villages through immense distances, with bad means of transit in the summer and no chance to speak in the winter, then, frankly, we do not. And if they had found them we are sure, judging from our own experience of the enormous labour of converting to Socialist assent much more suitable material, that they

would need many years of toil even to break down fierce and general opposition. The more clearly they made the peasants understand that they proposed to make their land communal property, the more furiously would their resentment burn.

Like most of our critics upon this matter, Mr. Ward safely assumes this and supposes that. He tells us that "it would be folly not to imagine that revolutionaries of the quality of our Russian comrades have not produced a workable scheme of co-operative farming as a transitional measure." Some people, of course, think it folly not to imagine anything that will help their argument or cover their lack of it.

Lastly, "the supineness and cowardice of the workers of Western Europe," or, to put it more correctly, their political ignorance, is just one of those important factors which must enter into the calculations of level-headed revolutionaries of Russia and this country alike. The recent elections, both in this country and in Germany, shows the depth of this political ignorance, and a great responsibility rests upon those who would lead the Bolsheviks to rely upon assistance that they cannot receive, and a spirit of revolt in other countries which does not exist.

ED. COM.

#### PAST CLASS STRUGGLES—Continued.

"A most sinful feast again," John Adams wrote, "everything which could delight the eye or allure the taste. Curds and creams, jellies, sweetmeats of various sorts, twenty sorts of tarts; fools, trifles, floating islands, and whipped syllabubs. These dainties were washed down with floods of Madeira." (Trevelyan, vol I., p. 225.)

Such were the poor down-trodden whose souls the times were trying (according to Thomas Paine), and who proposed vindicating the Rights of Man! Another comic tragedy was in process of production upon the stage of history. In relation to the above it is well to remember that the vast majority of the population at that time (excluding Indians) was composed of poor whites and slaves both black and white.

To prosecute the war the English proceeded to engage German mercenaries and disaffected Americans. By the offer of freedom to indentured servants they attracted many to their ranks so that the rebels were compelled to offer the same inducement.

The stock jobbery and wrangles of the English capitalists, in the attempt of each to make the war as lucrative as possible to himself, put England out of the running from the start. On the American side similar jobbery prevailed. I will quote Washington's own words:

Such a dearth of public spirit, and such want of virtue; such stock-jobbing, and fertility in all the low



arts to obtain advantages of one kind or another in this great change of military arrangement, I never saw before, and I pray God's mercy that I may never see again. (Trevelyan, Vol. I., p. 403.)

His letters during the war are full of similar complaints. All along he complains of the enormous desertions, sometimes of whole regiments, and of the difficulty of getting recruits. High bounties had to be offered by the different States before the various armies could be raised, and immediately their term of service was up they departed.

On both sides the aid of the Indians was extensively employed, and they were urged on by bribes to acts of the greatest barbarity.

The gentle refinement of Washington, the glorious example of American schoolboys of to-day, may be judged by the following:

During the summer (August and September, 1779) a terrible revenge was taken on the Iroquois for the Wyoming massacres by General Sullivan, who with 5,000 men devastated their whole country between the Susquehanna and Genesee rivers,—covered, we are told, with "pleasant villages and luxuriant corn-fields"—burning every village, giving no quarter. At one village, which is termed the "metropolis of the Genesee Valley," no less than 160,000 bushels of corn were destroyed. The Indians were pursued as far as the British fort of Niagara, and Indian agriculture was destroyed throughout the district. The total American loss did not exceed 40 men. The responsibility for these cruel measures lies at Washington's own door. His instructions to General Sullivan (May 31st) were "that the country may not be merely over-run, but destroyed." (Ludlow, p. 164.)

At length England agreed to evacuate America. It is noteworthy to mention (bearing in mind the much-vaunted Rights of Man) that one of the articles in the final capitulation stipulated the restoration of slaves and "prohibited the British from carrying away any Negroes or other property of the inhabitants."

Such was the great American Revolution. At bottom it was a fight between the privileged class of America and England to decide who should enjoy the wealth wrung from the slaves of both colours.

In early times to have imported free workers into America would not have sufficed for the needs of the privileged class, as the workers would have spread far and wide and gained their subsistence without working for a master. Hence workers had to be introduced in two particular forms of servitude (chattel slavery and indentured service) which tied them to their particular masters for a definite period or for life.

Long after the Revolution these forms of servitude continued. When economic development had rendered wage labour possible and more profitable, then the old forms of slavery disappeared.

GILAMC.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 179. Vol. 15.] LONDON, AUGUST, 1919. [MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## ALADINS' LAMP.

ANOTHER CONJUROR FAILS.

"THE NEW WAY. TO PAY OLD DEBTS, TO FIND NEW MONEY, AND REDUCE TAXATION." By JOHN T. DAY, Editor of the "Shoe and Leather Record."

In the above pamphlet Mr. Day, like most capitalist writers on economic subjects, makes quite a number of ill-considered statements, easily seen to be false or absurd. Most of these statements are unsupported by evidence of any kind, and no reasoning whatever is attempted to justify them. Sometimes in a further statement the author even supplies evidence, unconsciously, that exposes his previous utterances, as, for instance, when he says that "Money is only counters," and further on explains that "When we send money abroad in settlement of international balances, it goes as metal and not as money. It may or may not have been minted into sovereigns, but if it has it is more likely than not to be melted down at the end of its journey."

Surely this is direct and conclusive evidence that the metal contained in a sovereign is equal to the value stamped on its face. All Mr. Day's subsequent jeers at the gold standard, therefore, fall flat, because gold as a standard of price is real value, and the sovereign, being the unit of measure, is exchangeable for other forms of wealth in multiples or fractions of itself.

For the same reason our author's statement that "paper money is as good as any other for internal purposes" is only true up to a certain point and under favourable conditions. But why a difference between internal and external purposes? If it is lack of confidence which makes gold international money, then lack of confidence in the home government, industrial crises, or financial panic, will transform credit notes into

mere "scraps of paper," and gold immediately asserts itself as the only general equivalent embodying value—the only equivalent desired because its value is the result of embodied labour, which, of course, is the only source of exchange value. Credit in all its forms is only the acceptance of a promise to pay in the recognised medium of exchange. Neither commodities that are unsaleable, nor businesses that are redundant, are acceptable as equivalent or as security.

The credit system, therefore, depends for its stability on expanding trade. Directly markets show signs of failure to absorb the increasing mass of commodities flung indiscriminately upon them, up goes the bank rate. If this does not restrict production, a certain proportion of commodities become unsaleable, prices fall, small capitalists, unable to pay the high rate of interest or push their sales by extensive advertising, are the first to go to the wall—hence their agitation for "cheap money."

Mr. Day, as a champion of the smaller fish in the capitalist sea, is desirous of saving these smaller fish from the cannibal greed of the bigger fish, who in every industrial crisis scoop them up wholesale through bankruptcy. He, therefore, calls upon the Government to nationalise the Bank of England and provide State credit, i.e., provide the smaller capitalists with the necessary capital to carry on production in spite of a falling market.

But the large capitalists reply, in the language of Malthus, that the world is for the fittest, and when the world's commerce is convulsed with repeated shocks that shake down business houses in every crisis, a divine purpose is revealed because the big concerns, with their wider scope, can effect economies in production and cheapen



commodities for all mankind. To the small capitalists, as to the large, exploitation of the workers is natural, and is a necessary part of what would be the best of all possible systems, if they could only retain the plunder.

The predicament in which the small capitalists find themselves is due entirely to the natural development of the capitalist system. Competition between capitalists for a limited market must necessarily result in the success of those who operate with the largest amounts of capital. We see this truth emphasised daily, large concerns acquiring others in competition with them and amalgamating into groups with the object of controlling entire industries or markets.

The extinction of the small capitalist is no concern of the workers. Their immediate concern is how to escape exploitation altogether. If they side with him and endeavour to stop the progress of the big concerns, their action must be as futile and foolish as was that of the Luddites, who sought to hinder the march of machine production by smashing a few of the machines. It is no more possible to arrest the development of a social system than it is to re-establish the conditions of a former period or system.

In the United States a movement against the trusts has been on foot for years. A number of Acts have been placed on the Statute Book and, as one writer put it, "there is a growing hostility towards wealth"; but the power of the trusts has not diminished, and the amalgamation and absorption still go on.

In this country men like Mr. Day, instead of agitating against trusts, invent wonderful schemes for providing unlimited credit. Much more marvellous than the slave of the magic lamp, who only created wealth from nothing, he would transform the national debt—which is on the wrong side of nothing—into its equivalent of assets, or real wealth, by a magic system of book-keeping all his own.

Briefly, Mr. Day's idea is "that the Bank of England should be nationalised. That the Treasury should offer to exchange outstanding war bonds for what might be called national credit bonds, bearing a higher face value, but carrying no interest. These would be received at the Bank of England, and credit given for them at their face value. Thus the Bank and the Treasury would be as it were two pockets of the same garment, and when and whether the debt was paid to the Bank would be of little consequence. The whole transition would be merely a matter of book-keeping. No money would pass. Consequently, the entire debt might be quickly wiped out, in form as well as in substance, without a penny being raised by taxation."

If the matter were as simple as this the question might well be asked, why did not the Government print credit and treasury notes for the payment of everything they needed to prosecute the war? Mr. Day's scheme is the same in substance, the only difference being that he defers its adoption till after the war and increases the face value of the bonds by three per cent.

Those capitalists who availed themselves of the offer would gain the three per cent., but in doing so would renounce the interest periodically due to them, while at the same time their opportunities for investment would diminish as the amount withdrawn in this way increased. It must be obvious that no bank would receive and pay interest on credit or treasury notes unless a large percentage could be profitably loaned by them. The result would be a diminution, and possibly the disappearance, of interest on deposits. Mr. Day would, in any case, have not only cheap money, but, as the experiment progressed, vast quantities of idle money.

Of course, the scheme could never get as far as this. Some of the small capitalists, already tired of their five per cent. patriotism and hard up for capital, might avail themselves of it, but the vast majority would hang on to their five per cent. until they could see opportunities of using their capital in the ordinary way of exploitation for a higher return.

Mr. Day's new way to pay old debts, etc., so far as he is concerned, is an "Arabian Nights" dream. It must remain a dream because the big financiers and capitalists, who in group form control the political machinery in every country, actually use the bank rate as a brake on production. When the world's markets are saturated with commodities and demand begins to slacken, they beat the smaller capitalists out of the market with their high rate of interest and ensure for themselves the bulk of the trade.

But who gets the trade, or who pays the taxes, or the national debt, is of small interest to the working class. They can neither pay out of wages based on the cost of living, nor obtain anything more from trade than such wages. Their obvious course is, therefore, to understand why it is that, although they produce all the national wealth, their share is a bare living wage.

Large and small capitalists are united in one class to exploit the working class. The elimination of the small capitalists, or the more equitable distribution of trade, or capital, among capitalists generally, matters nothing to the workers. The more closely the latter examine all such questions the more convinced will they become that, for them, the one question that

transcends all others is their exploitation as a class. Their "New way to pay old debts" should be to gain control of the political machine, and to use the power they thus obtain to take from all capitalists, big and little, the right to exploit.

F. F.

## MORE ABOUT THE S.P. OF A.

Our June issue contained a brief statement upon the so-called Left Wing of the Socialist Party of America. Later information reveals developments of an interesting and somewhat dramatic character.

The National Executive Committee of the S.P. of A. at its session held in Chicago from the 24th to the 30th of May, expelled, without granting them a hearing, the whole of the S.P. of Michigan, comprising about 5,000 members, on the ground that their opposition to a reform programme is a violation of the Party constitution.

Following on this, the Russian, Lettish, Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian and South Slavic Federations within the S.P. of A., which support the "Left Wing" movement, were "suspended." All told, the Federations number about 30,000.

Naturally the Left Wingers are up in arms and refuse to recognise these actions of the N.E.C. They, moreover, accuse the N.E.C. of deliberately plotting to retain office by: (1) elimination of the Left Wing votes, cast by the expelled and suspended members, for the new N.E.C. and Party officials, the returns of the recent elections for which are being held up and kept secret; (2) excluding the delegates from these "Left Wing" groups to the Party Convention to be held on August 30th, at which the Left Wingers hoped to carry everything victoriously before them.

R. W. H.

The attention of all comrades and supporters is drawn to the list of propaganda meetings on the back page. Do the needful.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

**LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.**  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

## BY THE WAY.

It is often urged by opponents of Socialism that the workers have not that superior mental ability necessary to control society which, it is alleged, is possessed by members of the capitalist class and their professional hirelings. Even working men themselves engaged in highly skilled occupations take up the same cry that the workers are unfit mentally to run society. They have imbibed these things from early youth, and never seem to question the veracity of such obviously foolish assertions.

Turn in any direction you like and see who it is that to-day do the necessary work of society—run the railways and the ships, producing them also; obtain the coal from the bowels of the earth; in short, do all the necessary work in producing food, clothing, and shelter, and then ask yourself whether it is the overfed capitalist, with his wonderful "directive ability," or his slaves, the working class, who perform all the useful services in society.

If, then, the working class do all these things to-day, surely when they see the need for another system of society and unite to bring it about, they will have also the intelligence to control the society which they seek to establish.

Evidence abounds on every hand to show the bungling and incompetence of the ruling class to-day. Could, then, the workers, with their inexperience in controlling society, and their lower standard of education, do worse? Emphatically, no!

During the war there was the spectacle of the Antwerp expedition, the ill-starred Dardanelles campaign, the horrible treatment of the sick and wounded recorded in the Mesopotamia Commission Report, and sending sand to Egypt, to mention just a few instances relating purely to the military side. Other examples abound.

The food question offers another instance of mismanagement. Tons of foodstuffs have been destroyed at a time when the world was crying aloud for food. When we produce for use instead of for profit such cases as the following could not happen while the populace was clamouring for sustenance.

The fish glut continued at Grimsby yesterday, and after manure manufacturers had taken all their plants could deal with, tons of wholesome fish food were carted away to be thrown on the land for manure.

—*"Sunday Express,"* July 13th, 1919.

The workers to-day have sufficient intelligence to produce a superabundance of wealth which they hand over to an idle, parasitic class. When they equip themselves politically they have at hand the necessary weapons to secure



their emancipation and institute a system where social production will be accompanied by social ownership; in a word, Socialism. Join up and work for it.

"Never again!" and we are going to make "England a land fit for heroes" may be good stunts for a while, but the day of reckoning must come. Have I not scriptural authority for saying "Behold, what a man soweth that shall he also reap"? And in order to stave off the day of reckoning Lld. George and his gang are obliged to resort to camouflage and smoke screens in quick succession. One day it is a commission to try and pacify the miners; then on the subject of labour unrest and the high cost of living he steps into the shoes of Old Moore and kids his audience that all will be well in the Summer. To quote his own words—"By the Summer I hope that the cost of living in a working man's household will have gone down by about 4s. a week." Then we get the theatrical performance in the Commons about the Kaiser to be tried. Once upon a time he was to hang! Almost every week some sort of show is arranged in order to divert the attention of the masses. Cavell and Fryatt processions are arranged. Trafalgar Square is decorated for Joy Loan week. Inspections of the troops seems to be a very important item now that "we have crushed this horrible nightmare of Prussian militarism."

And so the game goes on, and side by side with it come the illustrations which go to show that the speakers who give utterance to the phrases quoted in the beginning of the previous paragraph, are talking with their tongues in their cheeks. I have newspaper extracts from various sources which would fill a whole issue of this journal relating to the way capitalism rewards its heroes.

One organisation recently founded for the benefit of ex-service men, states in an announcement concerning its activities, that—

Over 36,000 soldiers had been invalided out of the Army with nerve trouble, and nearly 6,000 were in pauper lunatic asylums, due to war service at the beginning of the present year. Since then the number has very largely increased, and it is still increasing daily.

The country is teeming with ex-service men suffering from physical and mental instability, who are in danger of becoming derelicts. In many cases they must ultimately drift into asylums unless they are taken in hand at once. I am convinced that nothing equal to the emergency will be done by the Government alone."—"Daily News," July 11th, 1919.

That the discharged and demobilised men are beginning to realise that they have been spoofed is evidenced by their refusal to take part in the various "peace festivities" and in the

resolutions passed in various parts of the country protesting about the treatment meted out to them. It all helps.

One other case from the same newspaper and in the same issue—

After serving in the Army, John Smith was discharged a few weeks ago. His efforts to find work as a porter were not successful and he was picked up in Greenwich by the L.C.C. Ambulance Service in a deplorable state of destitution and starvation.

The newspaper account goes on to say that after receiving attention he was taken to the infirmary, where "everything is being done to make him comfortable." This beautifully illustrates how safe the world has been made for democracy. After fighting for freedom this soldier's only reward is the freedom to starve.

"People who say there will be no more war are mistaken: You must keep up drill and a keen spirit, as you will be in the fighting next time."—Col. Methuen, D.S.O. (Rhodesian forces) to Cadets at Acton.—"Evening News," June 11th, 1919.

In the days of yore Mr. C. B. Stanton used to proclaim himself "a Socialist and a member of the old red international." Whether he ever really understood anything about Socialism is gravely open to doubt. Like many other labour leaders, he mouths the phrases in order to catch the votes and support of the unwary. Judging from recent events one might definitely say that he had joined the black international. According to newspaper reports the name of Mr. C. B. Stanton was attached to the letter accompanying the memorial against coal nationalisation, which was sent to the Prime Minister.

Our democratic King held a democratic garden party when most democrats were engaged in the democratic business of producing wealth. Anyone who read the account of those present, together with the description of their apparel, would readily realise this. However, as we who toil were unable to be present, we were "represented" by such stalwarts of the labour movement as Mr. Will Crooks and Mr. Stanton. Concerning the latter I read—

One of the most interesting things at Friday's garden party was the King's meeting with Mr. C. B. Stanton, whom his Majesty recognised at once. They had a long talk together, particularly about Labour subjects, and his Majesty was delighted with the frank and easy way in which the M.P. addressed himself to each topic raised. A little later Prince Albert saw the member in a crowd and begged someone to introduce him. "I know all about you," the Prince said, and am delighted to meet you."—"Sunday Express," July 13, 1919.

Peace! What an air of unreality there is about the official celebration of what our masters are pleased to term the peace. With a state of turmoil existing between the railwaymen and the N.E.R. Co. over the question of the eyesight test, the miners demanding the nationalization of the mines, and the Government increasing the price of coal by 6s. per ton, not to mention what one might call the hundred-and-one minor industrial troubles, the bosses order us to cease work for half-a-day, proclaim it a bank holiday, and a large number of us will receive capitalist generosity to the extent of being paid for a few paltry hours absence from the grindstone. Bells are being rung and sanctimonious humbugs and thieves are giving thanks to God for giving "us" the victory after millions of creatures "created in His own image" have been defacing "His handiwork"!

It is, of course, common knowledge that the great Powers have been engaged in a war for freedom and democracy, though I must confess that I should not have detected this sublime truth had not the papers and capitalist politicians told me so. In the matter of freedom the following extracts from the text of a Bill, reintroduced by Senator H. S. New, of Indiana, and which breathes freedom in every clause, was recently taken in the sixty-sixth Congress, with a view to suppressing Bolshevik activities in the United States, are illuminating.

That the display, exhibition, or appearance of a red flag, red banner or red emblem, or a black flag, black banner or black emblem at a meeting, gathering or parade, public or private, held for the purpose of political, governmental, social, business or religious discussion, is hereby declared to be unlawful and illegal.

That the advocacy, by speech or writing, of the overthrow, by violence or any other unlawful means, of the representative form of government now secured to the citizens of the United States, and the constitutions of the several States, is hereby declared to be unlawful and illegal.

That the organisation of, or attempt to organise, any association or society the object of which is to advocate the overthrow of the existing form of government of the United States by any unlawful means whatsoever, or the renting of any assembly hall or meeting place, with or without compensation, for the organisation of any association or society, the object of which is to advocate the overthrow of the existing form of constitutional government by violence, or unlawful means, is hereby declared to be unlawful and illegal.

That any person or persons convicted for violating any section of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.—"Christian Science Monitor," May 30th, 1919.

From the foregoing, noted in conjunction with similar steps being taken by other governments,

it would seem that the international capitalist class are getting the "wind up." It is necessary, then, for the workers the world over to study their position in society, to realise that the day is fast approaching when they must cross the line either to take their stand with that ever-increasing army of class-conscious workers desirous of ushering in the Socialist Commonwealth, or of actually opposing it. The class war is on. Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

In a leading article of the "Daily News" (4.7.19) dealing with Lloyd George's presentation of the peace treaty to the House of Commons there occurred amongst other matter the following statement and question, which are worthy of repetition here—

The argument that German colonies should be held by trustees responsible to the League of nations because in many cases Germans have ill-treated natives may deserve consideration. But are there no records of ill-treatment of natives by Belgians and Portuguese?

And I would add, as our contemporary appears to suffer from forgetfulness, is England free from guilt in this matter? Let the cocoa scribe, together with the news writers of what is often termed the Yellow Press, take a peep back into history, and re-read what Dr. Conan Doyle says in his "Crime of the Congo." Speaking of British responsibility in this matter he says (p. 13):

More important, however, is Article VI., both on account of the issues at stake, and because the signatories bound themselves solemnly, "in the name of Almighty God," to watch over its enforcement. It ran: "All the powers exercising foreign rights or influence in these territories pledge themselves to watch over the preservation of the native populations and the improvement of their moral and material conditions of existence, and to work together for the suppression of the slave trade." That was the pledge of the united nations of Europe. It is a disgrace to each of them, including ourselves, the way in which they have fulfilled that oath. Before their eyes, as I shall show in the sequel, they have had enacted one long, horrible tragedy, vouched for by priests and missionaries, traders, travellers and consuls, all corroborated by a Belgian commission of enquiry. They have seen these unhappy people, who were their wards, robbed of all they possessed, debauched, degraded, mutilated, tortured, murdered, all on such a scale as has never, to my knowledge, occurred before in the whole course of history, and now after all these years, with the facts notorious, we are still at the stage of polite diplomatic expostulations.

And yet nations so severely condemned by Conan Doyle for being untrue to their trust are to be entrusted with mandates for the administering of colonies and native populations!

THE SCOUT.



## A MATTER OF DEFINITION

Continued.

## MORE WEIRD STATEMENTS FORM A CAPITALIST APOLOGIST.

Mr. Drysdale divides his articles under two headings: "The Spirit of Revolution" (in which, as we have already seen, he mis-uses the word "revolution," giving a false definition in order to vent his political bias) and "Antidotes to Revolution" (in which he endeavours to reconcile opposing class interests by magnifying capitalist troubles and minimising or ignoring the effects of the capitalist system on the workers).

His most important conclusion is that the issue of paper money has depreciated the value of the sovereign in relation to the things it will buy, and the only remedy is for the workers to restore the balance by producing more wealth and practicing thrift more zealously, to meet the excess of credit. In other words, they must work harder and live more frugally in order that the capitalists as a whole may free themselves from their indebtedness to some of their number.

Like most capitalist writers who swear that they have no object but the truth, his adherence ends with declaring it. Henceforth he is only concerned with the force and cogency of his own shallow analysis and conclusions. Truth may be stranger than fiction, but the capitalist economist is seldom anything but a stranger to truth, and the premises on which Mr. Drysdale bases his so-called arguments are certainly stranger than truth, but would only raise a smile as fiction. He says:

We all eat bread, though not all in the sweat of our faces; and even the most industrious of the British consume more than they produce.

Consume more of what? If bread is meant, the question naturally arises, are all bakers in this country foreigners? If wealth in the literal and economic sense is intended, then Mr. Drysdale gives himself the lie when, further on, he says, "More people than ever before in our history are eating who do not produce." Those who do produce, then, must provide for them by producing more than they consume.

According to the last census there are, in this country, approximately twenty million adults out of a total population of forty-five million. From this twenty million we have to subtract six hundred thousand recorded as of no "no occupation," the entire personal of the Army and Navy, together with those who provide the machinery and munitions of war, the clergy, lawyers, flunkies, and many more. All these have to be fed, clothed, and housed, and

the deduction is plain that they are provided for by the rest of the adults, assisted by children, who must produce far more than they consume.

Next Mr. Drysdale says "equalisation of the ascertained wealth would only equalise misery, for each man's portion would be negligible."

The ascertained wealth of the country consists of the means of wealth production, land, mines, railways, factories and machines, together with the nature-given material. All this wealth is owned by the capitalist class, and their revenue from it in rent, interest, and profit—all of which is the result of the exploitation of the working class—amounts to two-thirds of the national income. The working class receives one-third as wages. Equalised or averaged out, each would receive barely sufficient for the necessities of life. The two-thirds taken by the capitalist class might, therefore, very conveniently be spread over the working class—who are the only people engaged in its production—without adding to their misery.

It must not be assumed, however, that this method is suggested as a basis for any reorganisation of the distribution of wealth. The above facts and figures may be verified in Mr. Chiozza Money's "Riches and Poverty," page 58, and merely prove that Mr. Drysdale's statement is untrue.

It is evidence of sheer humbug on the part of capitalist writers when they pretend that the only wealth capable of division is money. Mr. Drysdale knows very well that the money in circulation is only a very small fraction of the total wealth of society, which wealth is owned by the capitalist class, and divided amongst them, unequally, it is true, but in such a way that, although numbering only one-eighth of the population, they receive two-thirds of the annual income.

These statements of Mr. Drysdale's, together with many others, quite apart from their being untrue, are obviously absurd. Where he does not give himself the lie, the commonest of common sense, with a small dose of elementary arithmetic, shows their absurdity. His next statement is of a different character. He says—

The practical value of Socialism, as of Christianity—and the rulers of all countries have used them both—is that they are international, but the international bond of both alike snaps in the war under the opposing strain of the more domestic passion, patriotism.

This has been said, or written, by every capitalist hack who wanted to fling a cheap sneer at Socialism, since the war began. The boast about patriotism is worth very little. Economic necessity, jeers, white feathers, and conscription packed the Army. This was openly stated in the House of Commons, not by Labour members

though. Some idea of the numbers who went unwillingly can be gained by the congested state of the tribunals when dealing with appeals for exemption.

Capitalist attacks, throughout the war, have always been directed against the pseudo-Socialist organisations like the British Socialist Party and the Independent Labour Party, who have never once expressed antagonism to the war in Socialist terms. Consequently the Socialist position has never yet been met by capitalist defenders. Both before the war and since the champions of capitalism used both these dummy Socialist parties to show how easily they could vanquish Socialism. In Parliament, during the war, the capitalist statesmen and politicians never once had to meet Socialist arguments from the so-called Socialist members; nevertheless the capitalist Press continued to refer to the Labour Party as a Socialist party. Both capitalist parties know the value of the Labour Party in this respect, and it is only in this way that the rulers of the country "have used them."

It is only the international bond of Labourism that has snapped under the strain of war, as it was easy to foretell that it would. While the Labour Party continue to uphold the present system of society, in which human labour-power is a commodity, and the means of wealth-production and the results of the industrial process belong to the ruling class, they must, to be logical, support the capitalist State in every movement to extend markets, because the rapid sale and export of goods is essential to continuous production.

But the Socialist points out that every capitalist country can, or is rapidly reaching the point where it can, produce more wealth than it consumes, and is, therefore, compelled to join in the struggle for markets. The keener and more intense the struggle, the worse does the condition of the workers become. The success of one nation over others does not improve conditions for the workers of that nation, because the lack of employment in the beaten nations drives the workers into the countries where they are in demand (to mention one obvious reason). Thus capitalism makes the working class an international slave class—the very condition that, once given recognition by the workers, must form the basis of a genuine Socialist International. As this international slave class is everywhere compelled to organise and oppose the greed of the capitalist class, which becomes more insatiable with growing competition for markets, the antagonism of the labour market over the buying and selling of labour-power, is transformed, by the spread of

Socialist knowledge, into class antagonism. The working class then takes up its historic mission—the abolition of classes through the establishment of Socialism.

Mr. Drysdale's sneer at "international Socialism," therefore, only reveals two things which it would have been better, from his point of view, to have kept hidden: His own dishonesty or ignorance about Socialism on the one hand, and the treacherous part played by labour leaders and pseudo-Socialists in all the belligerent countries. Socialism is opposed to capitalism in all its forms and manifestations. Those leaders of working-class thought, therefore, who supported the war, in every country, and yet called themselves Socialists, accomplished a double treachery against the working-class.

F. F.

## COMPARISONS.

"We do not forget Jack Cornwall," said the Lord Mayor of London addressing some of the men of the Navy. The humbug of it is paralyzing to those who remember how the class for whom he was speaking kept Jack's mother out of her pension, tied up the money publicly subscribed for her benefit, and left her to starve.

Similar cant is the Government's eulogies of the rank and file who did the fighting and the suffering, and the workers who supplied the means by which the war was carried on and won. Thousands of those who bore and reared the men who died in the trenches or at sea, and those men and women, and boys and girls, who were blown to pieces in the munitions factories, are Old Age Pensioners, yet, we are informed by the "Daily Chronicle" (Aug. 5th), notwithstanding that the London Old Age Pensions Committee is "still urging the Government to authorise a special allowance to old age pensioners in order that none of them, owing to poverty, should be left out of the peace rejoicings," the Chancellor of the Exchequer "has hitherto declined to authorise a special allowance of 5s. to every pensioner, as recommended by the Committee."

And at the moment when they are refusing a stingy 5s. to the poverty-stricken fathers and mothers, and grandfathers and grandmothers, of their "heroes," they are showering hundreds of thousands upon their fighting-chiefs, and fighting like the very devil to pass a Bill to raise their own salaries from £2,000 a year to £5,000. They are as dead to shame as they are to humanity.

Stir yourselves, workers, and settle with the gang once for all.

J.







## THE MAKING OF A SOCIALIST.

Someone has said that fools learn from experience, and wise men from observation and reflection. If this be correct, it is to be feared that the dictum of Carlyle as to most people on these islands being found in the former category has a good deal of truth in it. Certainly, with regard to political and economic phenomena, the great majority of working-class men and women—even those who have a tendency towards independent thinking—seem to require something obvious and hammer-like to be forced on them in a quite personal way before they are able to visualise and focus the true political and economic situation and their place relative to it.

For instance, the loss of a dearly-loved relation or friend in war will be necessary before they can bring themselves to attempt fathom the cause and object of war; the disaster of unemployment must overtake them before they can understand the part unemployment plays in the present social system; the continuous scraping to make ends meet must be brought forcibly home to them before they can realise that the amount of the meagre wage they receive is based upon their cost of subsistence; the superciliousness or brutality to them personally by someone "drest in a little brief authority" must touch their self-esteem before the fact of their degradation as members of the "lower" class, as social slaves, can germinate in their brains.

In some way or other their self-interest must suffer before they can realise that politics is anything but a game played by followers of different schools of thought for their own amusement, or that economics is anything but a dry and pedantic subject, fit only for professional pedagogues and a few fanatics.

It is, of course, not surprising that such an attitude of mind should predominate. The early training of working-class men and women, both in the school and the home, the noxious doctrines inculcated later on from the pulpit, platform, and Press, all do their part in forming the working class into what the capitalists desire that they should become, that is, in the sphere of politics, adherents to, and supporters of, one or other of the orthodox political parties, and in the sphere of economics, hard-working, docile, and respectable wage slaves.

So complete and successful is the slave-morality engendered by the agents of the capitalists, and accepted without question by most of the contemporary generation of working-class men and women, that the younger and growing generation finds it almost impossible, without some particularly violent reaction, to fight

against the stream of capitalist ethics, and become instead opponents of capitalism; to become, indeed—at least in theory—what is, from the capitalist standpoint, immoral, irreligious, and unethical.

Even when this negative attitude of direct and bitter opposition to the capitalist system has been attained, it is practically useless inasmuch as it remains purely negative. A consciousness of the further development of society must be born; the knowledge that, following the inevitable downfall of the capitalist system—based as that system is on the production of wealth for profit—must come, in the ordinary course of evolution, a system based on production for use—the system known as Socialism—such knowledge must grow and fructify, otherwise the negative attitude of antagonism to capitalism is injurious to the individual, either soon ending in sterility, or developing into an *idée fixe*, with the unfortunate results of anarchy and chaos of intellect which such "fixed ideas" usually generate.

There is another fact to be taken into consideration. The mental process by which the opponent of capitalism becomes a Socialist is often retarded by his wanderings after fallacious ideals. He is sometimes caught in the toils of the reformist parties, is mentally fleeced and plundered by one or other of the pseudo-Socialist organisations, and it is only after many false starts and much perturbation and disillusionment that by means of a process of deduction he eventually arrives at what the force of circumstances and the logical sequence of events urge and finally compel him to become, that is, a class-conscious proletarian, with a historical sense of his place in nature and society, and a definite philosophical standpoint from which all phenomena can be judged and commended or condemned as the case may be—in short, a Socialist.

We have now arrived at the point where the Socialist, having evaded, or escaped from, the quicksands of pseudo-Socialism, has clearly realised the fact of his new theory of life, and has begun to take his part in the work of propaganda, which is so vital to the early and successful inauguration of the Socialist Commonwealth. There still remains, however, the need for unrelaxing vigilance in all that he thinks, or says, or does. While capitalism lasts the Socialist, who must of necessity live and work under the present system, is obliged, however much it goes against the grain, to accept, for all practical purposes, the morality of a system with which he finds himself totally at variance. Hence the paradox, that the Socialist, even while he is doing his utmost to overthrow a system which he hates, must at the same time

act, to a very great extent, at any rate, in accordance with, and adhere to, the conventions of that system.

It will be seen, therefore, that there is always a necessity for alertness, for a steadfastness of purpose, in the cause of Socialism, to militate against any possible undermining of the Socialist's principles. The Socialist, like any other member of the working class, has to live and work under capitalist conditions and has to conform, in the main, to the conventional morality of capitalism. But he must, at the same time, use every effort and take every opportunity to hasten the downfall of what has, in effect, become an obsolete social system, and to help inaugurate the next stage in the development of society.

One of the reasons of deflection from the principles of Socialism is to be found in the inability of certain superficial minds to build up, as it were, brick by brick, a philosophical structure, from whose topmost tower every hill and undulation of the workings of modern society can be surveyed. Unless the Socialist possesses a definite and unassailable point of view, it is really a misnomer to speak of him as a Socialist at all. He is simply one of those mental ineffectives who are always to be found attaching themselves to any unpopular cause and who, having no rock-bottomed principles, are easily swayed by any stronger personality with whom they happen to come in contact. If that stronger personality should be a direct or indirect agent of the capitalists, the result, of course, is the deviation from the Socialist cause to any passing craze, such as Woman's Suffrage, or Nationalisation, or something of that description. To such people capitalist environment is too strong to enable the somewhat vague and nebulous ideas they possess relating to Socialism to stand any chance of developing on right lines.

To the Socialist, to the man, that is, who has realised his position in nature and society, and who has built up for himself a philosophy of life in accordance with that realisation, the questions that would have vexed and distracted him in the non-Socialist days have become simplified to an enormous degree. Whether it be in the ordinary routine of every-day affairs, or in the realms of literature, art, or science, his whole activities will be examined in the light of their value to Socialism; the facts appertaining to the present social system will be arraigned and judged at the bar of the Socialist philosophy, and the results used in the most effective way in criticising capitalism and advocating the establishment of the new order of society.

It is hoped that the foregoing will give some

idea as to the making of Socialists, which, of course, is one of the main objects of the Socialist Party. The road to Socialism is a hard road, and perhaps this account of what is largely a personal experience may lend some assistance to those younger future comrades who are now groping more or less blindly toward the beacon—seen only by them at present as a faint and far-off glimmer—of the Socialist Commonwealth.  
F. J. WEBB.

## PEACE—COMPETITION—WAR.

On the day the Press was gushing and frothing over the spectacular peace-signing business (30.6.19) the "Daily News" published an editorial on the matter, and also several articles by those they designate "Great Men." The articles in question are best summed up as a conglomeration of contradictory vapourings.

In its editorial the "Daily News" sends up a hymn of thanksgiving that "the world has won its freedom," and then goes on to make the following curious remarks:

We are friends to-day with France, and our sincerest prayer is that that friendship will never be broken. She is again the most formidable figure on the Continent. She, almost alone, stands erect and triumphant over the ruins of Empires. We rejoice in her miraculous recovery; but we should be fools to blind ourselves to the implications. (Italics mine.)

These sound pacific words! What is the nature of the implications to which we must not blind ourselves? Of course the nature is the old capitalist nature. The crushing of Germany has strengthened the commercial power of France—one of the competitors in the rush for the world's markets.

The article goes on further to enlighten us:

And is there anyone who looks to Japan and the Far East without large and vague apprehensions? Or Westward across the Atlantic without wondering what the future has in store there and realising, however dimly, that if the United States is compelled to forsake its historic pacificism for militarism it is sea power which will be its capital concern.

Undoubtedly the above shows that the present peace is to be a lasting one! The subscribers to this view have evidently studied the relativity of all things, and the meaning they attach to "lasting" is a day or two—or rather its a lasting peace until the next great war!

The idea of setting up America with her gigantic naval programme as a pacifist nation is truly comical. In the last twenty-five years America has been at war with Spain, the Philippines, China, and Germany, to say nothing of the murderous slaughter of American working



men in the various strikes. At the moment of writing it is announced that America contemplates the construction of two liners larger than anything afloat, and so constructed that they are easily convertible into *commerce protectors*.

The Peace Treaty receives anything but a glowing reference from the "Daily News." "It does not aim at abolishing militarism; it aims at abolishing Prussia," is their tribute to the efforts of Lloyd George & Co.

After mourning over the defects of the Peace Treaty the article hails the "League of Nations" as the new deliverer and the promise of a glorious future. It then proceeds to knock the bottom out of the League with the following remarks:

There are grave defects in this momentous document. The provision that unanimity is required for action is the most disquieting of these defects.

And we might tack on this the fact that, so far, the League consists mainly of England, France, and America, and excludes the Central Powers; also that the nations composing the League are laying themselves out for more efficient predatory forces than ever, as witness America's mighty warships, Britain's gigantic airships and flying machines, and the recent big armament combine, Explosives, Ltd.

Things certainly look promising!

From the other articles, in the same paper, already alluded to I will extract some of the wisdom of the "Great Men."

Sir Walter Runciman writes:

Now that peace is signed, the first necessity for the British Empire and for the whole world is to get trade going everywhere. . . . Only by a full stream of trade can the flow of food and goods between all peoples wipe out hunger, misery, and unemployment, and possibly anarchy.

Capital lying idle is unfruitful, but capital employed in trade brings in rich returns, hence the anxiety of the profit seekers to get on with the business. That a full stream of trade will wipe out hunger, etc., is the usual delusive humbug of the employing class. Just prior to the war trade was booming everywhere. Statistics showed relatively higher returns than ever before, and yet the lackeys of the master class (Lloyd George among them) admitted that there was greater poverty and misery existing than any previous records showed. For years the number of inmates in the lunatic asylums, and the number of homeless on the streets of London, had been growing. With the improvement in productive processes and machinery, and the increase in the number of women in industry, brought about by the war, we have far worse times ahead when trade booms again.

Another writer, Dr. Clifford, says:

The seed of new wars are sown with a prodigal hand. . . . An economic struggle is to follow the military, and an international trade rivalry is arranged to block the way to international co-operation and reconciliation.

As he correctly states, the seeds of new wars are already sown—the seeds of war exist in the very marrow of capitalism. The economic laws governing capitalism drive different sections into trade conflict, and it becomes a question of the eclipse of a particular section or a trial of arms.

The seeds of new wars are not hard to discover. While England has been deeply involved in war, America has been restoring her ship-building industries, which were previously decaying, and now ranges herself against England as a powerful competitor in the shipbuilding and carrying trades.

At the recent coal enquiry competent witnesses expressed the fear that in the future America and France would be serious competitors in the iron and steel trades.

For some years Japan and America have been in a state of doubtful friendship in their competition for the Chinese trade. Latterly China has been developing rapidly, and may soon be able to supply a great part of her own needs, and also compete abroad. We may witness the spectacle of Japan and America at each other's throats over the Chinese market, and either or both at the throat of China to force her to accept their goods.

Japan is becoming yearly a more serious competitor in European markets, and "cheap German muck" may yet give place to "cheap Japanese muck."

In a note relating to a conversation with a "well-known authority in the City," headed "Japan ready to sell," in the "Daily News" (9.7.19.) the following appears:

Japan is manufacturing all the fancy goods, the cheap crockery, the toilet and clothes brushes, and the thousand-and-one little knick-knacks that used to come from Germany and Austria. . . . The Japanese are making just those goods which we formerly imported from enemy countries on account of their cheapness.

A writer in the "Penny Magazine" during the last two months also points out that Japan, India, and America are steadily encroaching upon England's cotton trade. Modern inventions have deprived Lancashire of the advantage she formerly possessed in her humid atmosphere. As the other countries possess the raw material (and Lancashire does not) and can produce the necessary atmosphere artificially, Lancashire is going downhill and may be crushed out of the trade eventually.

That "our staunch ally," Japan (who is pinching our trade!) has learnt from the expe-

rience of the leading nations, and is developing her industries and piling up her wealth strictly in accordance with capitalist tradition, is borne out by the New York special correspondent of the "Daily News" (16.7.19.) in the following quotation relating to Korea:

The regular use of torture, the establishment of compulsory prostitution, the promotion of the opium traffic, the suppression of free speech, the repeated flogging of women, the massacre of scores of unarmed people at a time when no disturbance was proceeding, and many other atrocities indicate that Japan should spare no effort to dismiss officials responsible and completely change her attitude towards this problem.

Already Japan is confronted with the Chinese boycott, which tends to substitute American for Japanese trade. Her Korean policy must inevitably determine her position in the Far East, and beyond all question the cruelties practised in Korea have caused indignation here.

If Japan continues to forge ahead it can easily be seen that she may soon become an "enemy country" so far as the other leading capitalist nations are concerned. The recent disclosure by President Wilson of the secret treaty between Japan, Germany, and Russia, if true, shows that Japan is well up to her rivals in the unscrupulous scramble for markets.

In spite of the ringing of the joy bells of peace England is still at war in India and Russia.

India, as well as pinching our trade, is developing in other directions. She is the world's greatest producer of hides, and the only producer of jute, while her export of manganese and tungsten materially affects the manufacture of steel in Europe. Such a prize must be retained at all costs.

A side-light on the intervention of England in Russia is given in by Sir A. Steel-Maitland when addressing business men interested in Russian trade. He said:

In the next 20 years the part of the world where trade expansion was likely to be quickest was in Central and South-Eastern Russia, and the enormous belt of country east of the Urals. British traders now had a good chance of establishing themselves there. —"Daily News," 12.7.19.

In "The World's Work" during the war Mr. R. C. Martens (of Martens & Co., a large American commercial concern) contributed an article and a series of maps relating to the resources of European and Asiatic Russia. In the course of the article he made the following remarks:

The war has caused American manufactures to double at least. Most other countries have also expanded their manufacturing capacities with the result that the world's manufacturing capacity is at least three times as great as it was before the war. . . . Will the industrial nations not have to look for markets for their surplus in lands where there is greatest natural wealth? If so, Russia will assuredly be the greatest commercial field in the world at the end of this war.

And he closes the article with this significant remark:

The opportunity is waiting.

No wonder England and the "great democracy of the West" are taking such a fatherly and bloodthirsty interest in Russian affairs.

The "Daily Chronicle" for August 6th adds its quota to the mass of evidence supporting our contention. Under the heading "Tariff War Breaks Out in Europe" our contemporary reports:

. . . the introduction into Italy of hats, caps, gloves, and umbrellas is wholly forbidden. So, too are threads, textiles, and all semi-manufactured goods, whether in wool, linen, cotton, hemp, or jute.

The same applies to agricultural machinery and to all parts thereof. . . .

#### BOHEMIA'S COUNTER TARIFF.

. . . Already Bohemia has retaliated on the shutting out of her glass wares by imposing a steep tariff of 200 kronen on Italian wines.

The report then goes on to declare that there is every prospect of Sweden, who had made the promised supply of paper pulp dependent upon the admission into Italy of certain cheap paper goods, retaliating by stopping the paper pulp supply. Truly, we are a happy family in these days of universal peace!

As the military war waned the trade war took its place and rages with greater violence every day. The inevitable result will be another recourse to the battlefield.

So that the last doubt may be dispelled from the minds of readers as to the everlasting nature of the "peace" I will conclude with another quotation from the "Daily News" (12.7.19.)

Sir Douglas Haig and Admiral Sir Roger Keyes received the freedom of the city (Aberdeen) to-day, and also honorary degrees of the University. Sir Douglas, in reply, urged that every growing lad should be taught the use of the rifle, so that when the next great trial came, "as one day it surely will," we should be found a nation in arms, ready and prepared to meet it.

As the Socialist Party has all along pointed out, the wars of civilised countries, since the birth of the capitalist system, have been caused through the struggles between sections of the world's capitalist class for the trade routes, raw materials, markets, and the like. As long as there is commodity production, buying and selling, with the consequent competition among buyers and sellers and the enslavement of the producing class, wars are of the very essence of things. Lasting peace can only arrive when the private ownership of the means of living has been abolished and common ownership has emerged from the ruins—in other words, wars and all the other evils that are a consequence of capitalism can only disappear when capitalism gives place to Socialism. GILMAC.



## SLAVERY.

When the average working man hears the word "slavery" a picture usually flashes across his mind of a black man working with a gang on a plantation in some far-distant land, with the cruel whip of the overseer continually applied to his dusky back to urge him on to greater efforts. Perhaps our "free" worker recalls having seen in childhood, the magic lantern pictures that tell the story of the famous "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Then he shrugs his shoulders and thanks God he was not born a nigger.

Slavery in various forms has existed from the remote past—since the origin of private property (during barbaric times). Has slavery ceased with the growth of the great "democratic" States of to-day? To answer this question it is necessary to enquire a little closer as to what slavery really is.

A slave is one who is compelled to work the whole or part of his time for another. The chattel-slave gives up all his time, the bond-slave a part.

Thus the Romans put foreigners captured in war to work in mines, in their houses, and on their lands. The pious pilgrim fathers of North America bought negroes for rum, and sold them to the Southern planters.

Although the Roman slave and the negro slave were acquired bodily and for life, they were not taken for the good of their health, nor out of charity; they were taken to work for their respective masters, and their lives were only of worth to the masters as long as they could work, as the fearful annals of slavery show only too clearly.

The era of purchasing a slave bodily as a chattel, or binding him for definite a period, as a serf, has passed away, but has the era of slavery passed also?

We are told by politicians of various shades of opinion that in the past people were wicked and enslaved their fellow beings, but that now things are very different—we are a free people. The writer of these lines, who is one of the "free" people, has a weakness for sunny slopes, shady trees, and cool, country breezes these warm days, but so soon as he commences to make plans for a trip to Arcadia his freedom has a disagreeable habit of vanishing. If he goes away (that is if he can raise the wind!) he will lose his job, for employers won't allow workmen to play fast and loose with their jobs. There is always somebody outside the gate whom hunger will drive to forego holidays in order to keep the job.

If we can't get jobs we must starve, and if we are caught starving we are likely to be jailed for not having "visible means of subsistence"

—this appears to be rather a curious form of freedom!

All around us are vast factories, and workshops of various descriptions, in which we—who are called the working class—work. We are given a job at the will of somebody else, and sacked at his will. We depend for our existence on obtaining work, as we possess nothing with which to obtain the necessities of life, and consequently depend upon the sale of our working power. We are, therefore, in a state of dependence upon those who give us work.

Those who give us work are the owners of the vast works already alluded to. We are the slaves of the employing class.

Through owning all the means of production the employers compel us to work under the conditions they lay down, and we must abide by these conditions or starve. The only way we can escape capitalism is by getting off the earth.

Our form of slavery, wage-slavery, is in some respects worse than previous forms. The buyer of a chattel slave generally found it to his advantage to feed and house the slave well: a well-fed slave was capable of working harder, and lived longer, than an ill-fed one. He was property, the same as a horse, and his death meant a fresh outlay to buy another. In the case of the wage-slave it is different. His power to work is purchased in many cases from hour to hour, in some instances from week to week, but in comparatively few cases for longer periods. If he is ill or dies it does not matter to the employer, as he has only bought certain amounts of labour power, which he never pays for until it has been expended in his factory, field, mine, workshop, office, or the like. Therefore he loses nothing by the death of his wage thrall, and the labour power of other men will do just as well to continue the work. There are always plenty to fill vacant jobs, as discharged and demobilised soldiers are learning to their cost.

Philanthropists and labour leaders put before you various propositions as means to ameliorate your lot, but very little examination will show you that anything short of the overthrow of capitalism leaves you as you are—a wage slave.

So long as capitalism lasts the laws governing it will last. Under capitalism the workers' labour power is bought and sold on the market the same as any other commodity, and is therefore amenable to commodity laws. It is a matter of experience that there is always an over supply of workers, and consequently wages on an average rule at the lowest cost of subsistence—i.e., the lowest on which a worker can live, reproduce his kind, and do the particular class of work required.

No reforms can touch this position—the laws of capitalism nullify reforms.

We are slaves and will remain slaves as long as we allow the employing class to rob us of the products of our toil.

We, the working class, produce all the wealth of the world, but the capitalist or employing class own it, through their ownership of the powers of production. Therefore to obtain our freedom we must overthrow capitalism, i.e., modern private ownership, and substitute common ownership.

Capitalism only exists with your consent. You give this consent at election time by voting the capitalists into power. Withhold your consent, i.e., vote yourselves into power, and capitalism will give place to Socialism.

So long as you vote for capitalism you are unfit for Socialism—you are not class-conscious.

Confusionist bodies of various kinds may increase their following in various ways by compounding in various ways, but they cannot gain the support of class-conscious working men—fit subjects for Socialism. In other words, they do not get an inch nearer the ultimate goal by holding up the promise of immediate but delusive gains. Only the confused will support the confusionist.

The capitalist keeps his privileged position by controlling the machinery of government, which he uses to keep us in subjection. This is the citadel we must attack, and carry, to usher in the Socialist Commonwealth, and thereby abolish human slavery for ever. GILMAC.

## THE POLICE V. THE POLICE.

The capitalist Press has been busy explaining to Simple Simon that the action of the police in "breaking their oath" is not only mutiny, but "a crime." Of course, it is always a crime when the bulldog turns and rends its master's hand, notwithstanding that that hand was doing things with a stick. But there is another side to the question.

During the long period when the workers were more somnolent than they are now, and that condition was reflected in a far more incomplete organisation and a far greater trust in and submission to their union officials, the bosses were not so much afraid of the "labour unrest" as they are to-day. Consequently they did not attach the same importance to the bobby as they do now, and they made the mistake of paying him accordingly.

The result was inevitable. Notwithstanding his oath, the policeman was forced to struggle for a betterment of his miserable condition. More even than in other trades—if that were possible—this necessarily meant organisation. A union was formed, and as the aspect of indus-

trial affairs became darker, a police trade union, affiliated possibly with other trade unions, deriving a certain amount of its strength from those unions, was regarded as an extremely sinister thing.

The bosses got a bit nervous. They made panic concessions, and then they started to cut out the "cancer"—in other words, to smash the union.

Now it is quite clear that the men owed every jot and tittle of the improvement in their condition to the union. Their oath availed them nothing. It was only intended to bind them to vile conditions of pay and tyrannical discipline. They might have stood meekly by it till doomsday, nothing would have been done for them. Only when they seriously threatened to commit the "crime" of leaving their oath to look after itself, as butcher Asquith did his registration and other pledges, and Lloyd George did his pledge concerning sending young boys to the "front," did the masters deign to give them some measure of alleviation.

It is quite plain, then, where the crime comes in. It is certainly not in breaking their oath, which they had been driven to do by the callous indifference of the bosses to their claims, but in their desertion of the instrument which had gained them so much. To allow that to be crushed out, and those who had undertaken the task of organising them for the struggle, to go down in the hour of victory is both a mean and cowardly crime.

Writers in this paper have previously pointed out how extremely unlikely it was that any sort of union that could be any good to the men would secure official recognition. The forecast seems to be pretty correct. Had the police, however, behaved with sufficient courage and intelligence as to force the question of recognition to a successful issue, the simple and inevitable result must have been the increased use of bayonets instead of batons in industrial disputes. The masters have more strings than one to their bow. A. E. J.

## S.P.G.B. £1,000 FUND. SIXPENNY COLLECTION.

Winning Numbers:—

1,704; 724; 1,839; 554; 2,964; 1,278;  
1,802; 1,501; 696; 1,269; 134; 2,721;  
1,846; 1,912; 843; 2,743; 1,605; 1,770;  
534; 78; 62; 1,863; 689; 2,735; 785;  
2,324; 410; 2,181; 1,582; 2,494.

PRIZES NOT CLAIMED on or before August 31st will be sold.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY,  
17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.



## OUR £1,000 FUND.

We give below a further list of subscriptions and other additions to our fund. It will be noticed that the vast bulk of the increase since our last list was published consists of the fruits of the Sixpenny Collection, and Branch donations. The amount given as ordinary direct individual contributions, as also the increment from collecting sheets, have fallen to a very low level, and there is only one way to draw any comfort from the contemplation of them. That is to remember that no less an authority than J. Christ has declared that "The poor shall inherit the earth." [From that point of view the state of our fund is reassuring! But—

## TENTH LIST.

Already acknowledged	-	£343	2	2½
Received from "Sixpenny Collection"	-	45	6	6
Battersea Branch Donation	-	5	0	0
" " Collection	-	1	4	3
Islington Branch	-	1	0	0
Tooting Branch	-	1	0	0
H. J. Mills, Canada	-	1	10	0
A. E. J.	-	1	0	0
F. J. H., Hornsey	-	1	0	0
A. Shearstone, 8s.; L. Shearstone, 8s.	-			
(Stirling, N.B.)	-	16	0	
Collected. Sheet 226, West Ham	-	8	3	
" " —, Hedges (Battersea)	-	14	0	
Gallaher and Friends (Hanley, Staffs.)	-	8	6	
Ted Morris and Friends (Southsea)	-	10	0	
J. R. Adams (West Ham)	-	10	0	
— Hood	-	2	3	
K. (Curragh, Ireland)	-	5	0	
J. Simmons (Nottingham)	-	2	6	
H. Bril'slyper	-	1	0	
M. A. B. (Fulham)	-	3	0	
A. H.	-	2	6	
Wm. Gill	-	1	0	
T. Houchin	-		6	
Wage Slave (Manchester)	-	2	6	
The Scout	-	5	0	

Total £404 14 11½

S. P. G. B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS  
FOR AUGUST.

## LONDON DISTRICT.

## Sundays:

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.  
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.  
Finsbury Park, 6 p.m.  
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.  
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.  
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7.30 p.m.

## Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

## Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

## Fridays:

Tottenham, St. Ann's Road, 8 p.m.  
Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

## Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156, High St.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY  
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

## OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

## HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 181. Vol. 16.]

LONDON, SEPT., 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

## COBDENISM & SOCIALISM.

A REPLY TO PHILIP SNOWDEN.

In the issue of "Common Sense" dated 16th August last, Mr. Philip Snowden, Chairman of the Independent Labour Party, in the performance of his function as a capitalist hireling and misleader of the working class, tries his utmost to traduce Socialism and identify Socialist principles and policy with those of his capitalist masters. He opens his column-and-a-half of lucrative trash with the cynical statement that "The superficial Cobdenite and the superficial Socialist would probably declare that Cobdenism and Socialism are the antipodes of political and social theories."

The implication is, of course, that Mr. Snowden is not either a "superficial Socialist" or a "superficial Cobdenite." He is right. Qualify the Socialist and the Cobdenite in any way and to the very utmost limit that will leave them still a Socialist and a Cobdenite respectively, and you have not the political likeness of the Chairman of the I.L.P. in either. Both the Socialist and the Cobdenite, superficial (whatever that may mean) or otherwise, must declare that Cobdenism and Socialism are the very antipodes of the social and political spheres. It is only the pretenders, the twisters, the hired assassins of working class thought, that try to reconcile the one with the other, and the sordid

and sickening motives that lead them to do so protrude like the fitting stinking members of a half-buried simile. carcass from the slime of some pestilential pool.

When Mr. Snowden says that the "aim and purpose of Cobden and his school," as he understands it (sic), "is precisely the aim and purpose of Socialism," he lies. He does not understand the aim and purpose of Cobdenism to be "to secure the largest possible measure of

individual liberty in a well ordered State and in a well-ordered world." No one knows better than Mr. Snowden that the school of Cobden are not at all concerned with the liberty of the individual where that individual is a worker; no one knows better than Mr. Snowden that

Cobden and all his school and disciples—yes, even as "The Superficial" he understands them—cling with might and main to the capitalist State, the capitalist

Humbug. world, to the last pinch of gunpowder and the last loyal bayonet; and no one in all the wide world knows better than Mr. Snowden that, except from the capitalists' point of view, the capitalist State and the capitalist world can never be well ordered.

When Mr. Snowden says "Cobden differed from modern Socialists in his ideas as to the best method of attaining that desirable state of complete individual liberty, but there are certain fundamental conditions of attaining to that state of liberty, without the practical application of which neither Socialism nor any other plan of social organisation will achieve the purpose," he is simply resorting to "Words that weary and perplex, and pander and conceal." The fundamental condition under which alone the Cobdenites can realise their aspirations is the slavery of the workers based upon the class ownership of the means of living. The fundamental condition for the achievement of the aspirations of the Socialists is the abolition of class ownership—of private ownership in any form—of the means of living, and the establishment of

A Fundamental Difference. society upon a basis of common ownership, as the only method of setting the workers free from the domination of those who own the means whereby they live.



Brought face to face with this aspect of the case, the Chairman of the I.L.P. would have to admit its truth. This in itself proves the falsity of the implication of his statement concerning the probable declaration of the "superficial Cobdenite and the superficial Socialist." The Cobdenite stands for private property; the Socialist stands for the abolition of private property. These two things ARE "the antipodes of political and social theories," all the bought and paid for capitalist servants of the I.L.P. notwithstanding.

"It had been customary previously, whenever any reference was made by Socialist writers and speakers of fiscal policy, to dismiss the controversy between Free Trade and Protection as a quarrel on the most effective method of enriching the exploiting classes," our confusionist goes on. "But when Mr. Chamberlain made the issue one of practical politics the Socialists realised that the matter was one which vitally affected the welfare of the wage-earning classes."

The argument that that which, when it was in the merely controversial field, was "a quarrel on the most effective method of enriching the exploiting classes," could, when it was made a question of "practical politics," become a matter vitally affecting the welfare of the workers is the argument of the opportunist twister. What he really means is that as long as the Protectionists did not seriously threaten to impose their fiscal fetters upon the Free Traders, Mr. Snowden and those of his kidney, for and on behalf of whom he lays claim to the title "Socialist," could afford to tell the truth about the question of Free Trade and Protection, but as soon as the question became an "issue of practical politics," a rallying cry for party leaders, a plank for party platforms, an inscription for party banners, a bait to trap the votes of workers in their exploiters' interests, then the pretenders became involved. They had to enthuse. They had to discern in the question something that had never revealed itself to them before. Why? I will tell you.

Some time ago Mr. Snowden declared that the Labour Party is not a Socialist party, and that its function is to keep the Liberal Party in office. The inwardness of this statement provides the explanation for his brotherly feeling towards the Cobdenites. He himself is no stranger to the Labour Party, which is the medium for providing £400 a year for certain twisters who are ready to keep the Liberals in power when they are in power, and to help get them into power when they are under a cloud. Mr. Snowden is simply trying to get his bread buttered—that is all.

Refuse to be the victims of the labour sharks any longer.

A. E. J.

## BY THE WAY.

We have for several months now been hearing with wearying monotony that the panacea for the country's ills is work, more work, and still more work. The fact that there are 350,000 demobbed soldiers who cannot find employment does not, it seems, trouble the master class, the idea clearly being to try and persuade those workers already engaged in production to work a little harder and, incidentally, of course, provide their masters with swollen profits. On the other hand, those who are clamouring for a job being unable to obtain one, will have some "incentive" to join up again in the "voluntary" army and "see the world and be paid for doing so." Beautiful idea, this!

While we workers are being urged by labour leaders and other capitalist hacks to increase production, and are daily treated to liberal doses of chatter about reconstruction, our masters see to it that they religiously obtain from such an undignified task themselves. Are we not termed workers, and they—well, just a simple word—shirkers?

Take a cursory glance round and see the strenuous life they lead. Look how hard they work during the season. They attend the Eton and Harrow, the Oxford and Cambridge matches, visit the operas and the beauty spots of the world, and generally enjoy the good things of life. As we struggle in overcrowded trains and trams in a frantic endeavour to get work, as if this were the be-all and end-all of our existence, I read that—

During Ascot week the London and South Western Railway ran 74 extra trains, saloon and first class only, at special fares; and 63 extra trains of first and third class mixed, with ordinary first class fares and special third-class fares.

—*"Daily News,"* July 23rd, 1919.

After this off to the moors for a little shooting, and all at the very time when we are informed that without increased production we shall go headlong to ruin and disaster. What swank! Is it not time the workers awoke, rubbed their eyes, and proceeded to inaugurate a social system wherein all the physically fit adults contribute their quota of labour for the social good.—where all engaged in healthy work and none were overworked?

For four years we were enjoined to hate Germany and all things appertaining to it, at the same time being told that after hostilities had ceased some time must elapse before we could stretch out our hands or to have intercourse with our late "enemies." In a few words they were to be treated as moral lepers. How soon these

things have been forgotten by those who uttered them is evidenced by the following extract:

It is reported that German bankers have been discussing with bankers over here the loan of £100,000,000—we to lend the money. . . . We have no very great faith in the patriotism or unselfishness of cosmopolitan financiers; and we certainly hope that Parliament will not let this loan slip through by default. Unfortunately, cosmopolitan finance is not without its strong supporters in this present House of Commons, to say nothing of the House of Lords.

—*"Reynolds's,"* August 10th, 1919.

No doubt the general upheaval caused by the war, coupled with the spreading of what is often termed Bolshevism, has tended to widen the outlook of some sections of the capitalist class, and in order to preserve their interests they are prepared to eat their own words. We now read of the allied and associated powers considering the wisdom of granting loans and once again entering into trade relations with the "enemy."

The glories of war. "Dr. Williams, tuberculosis officer for Flint and Denbigh, told the Flintshire Insurance Committee yesterday that the death-rate from consumption had increased enormously since the war, and we were back in the position of 25 or 30 years ago."—*"Daily News,"* August 15th, 1919.

Not long since there was a great hullabaloo in connection with the trip of the R 34 airship from England to the United States. It is strange indeed that one should read in the columns of a paper which makes the claim that if you read it in that journal "it is so," such a belittling announcement as the following. Says Horatio Bottomley:

It is not generally known that the R 34, which has recently so distinguished itself in its cross-Atlantic flights, is an exact replica of one of the German super-Zeppelins captured by us.—*"John Bull,"* July 27th, 1919.

"Unto him that hath shall be given." While Tommy and Jack may think themselves lucky on receiving a few paltry pounds for "saving the country," and incidentally spending three or four years of their lives in muddy trenches or on the ocean waves, not to mention stopping bullets and shells, the master class see to it that the "big men" are well rewarded for services rendered. Now I might expatiate on so interesting a subject, but I forbear. I should be biassed. Rather, therefore, would I quote from a capitalist authority. So here you are:

Parliament has been pleased to grant from £100,000 to £10,000 to eighteen leading soldiers and sailors. The nation does not wish to be niggardly to men who

have served it so well; but we doubt whether there is anything like general satisfaction at this separation of the sheep and the goats. General Blank and Tommy Atkins both did their duty, and offered their lives and their energies to the nation. One, already receiving high pay, gets some thousands of pounds; the other, receiving very low pay, gets twenty-nine shillings a week unemployment dole if he cannot find work, and nothing if he can.

—*"Reynolds's,"* August 8th, 1919.

The lower cost of living "foretold" by G. H. Roberts, the Food Controller, and the Prime Minister is well illustrated by the following: "Official figures supplied by the 'Labour Gazette' show that the cost of living this month has advanced 5 per cent. on the previous month, or 115 per cent. above the pre-war cost.

Just before the armistice (Nov. 1918) 120 per cent.  
June, 1919 . . . . . 105 " "  
July, 1919 . . . . . 110 " "  
August, 1919 . . . . . 115 " "

The worker may well ask himself if his wages have increased in proportion.

In order to demonstrate to the Germans our intense dislike of militarism "a salute of 19 guns was fired on the river front of the Hohen-zollern Bridge," so we were informed, on the occasion of the visit to headquarters of the Secretary for War, The Right Hon. Winston Churchill. It is to be hoped that they are now duly impressed by this pompous military reception.

The following item of news makes interesting reading in the light of what has been said and written concerning England's late "chief enemy."

An article has been published in the Moscow "Investia" showing (according to the Bolshevik wireless message) to what extent the "supposed German Republic" has become an agent of the Entente, and affiliated to the House of Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Wilson and Co.

"The chief objects of this honourable house," says the article, "is the struggle against Bolshevism." —*Star,* August 26th, 1919.

From which I gather that the much-hated "Hun" is useful if only to assist the Allies in their fight against the Bolsheviks.

We have heard during the late war quite a lot of talk about the blood of Frenchmen and Englishmen, which has been so freely shed, cementing the ties of friendship between the two nations. But now the question of the division of the spoils is coming to the fore the pretty prattle of yesterday vanishes into thin air. Concerning this interesting question a Paris newspaper ("*Soir*") comments thus on the question of Syria:



The continuity of British territory from India to Cairo may be an advantage to our Ally, but we regret the animosity which it has evoked in this matter.

—“Star,” Aug. 26th, 1919.

Further information with regard to the Paris newspaper and the French Economic Commission, just returned from Syria, tells us that “the interview, portions of which have been deleted by the censor, consists of a review of the economic position in Syria, and gives a very pessimistic impression of the outlook for French trade, industry, and finance in consequence, mainly, it is stated, of the activities of the British.

Again, later, we are told—

Regarding the alleged incidents in Syria the “*Homme Libre*” states that for some time past friction with Great Britain has increased only too much.

The “*Liberte*” says: British officials are convinced that our exclusion is necessary to the security of the British Indian Empire, which to their mind, ought to stretch from Calcutta to the Cape by way of Cairo.

At most they will consent to leave us, like a bone thrown to a dog, the narrow band of the Lebanon coast, just as in the eighteenth century they left us Pondicherry and Chandernagor. They have only forgotten one thing, and that is that then we were conquered and enemies, and to-day we are conquerors and Allies.—“*Daily News*,” September 3rd, 1919.

All this reminds me of the old saw of our school-boy copy books—“When thieves fall out honest men come by their own.” More information on this subject can be gathered from the secret treaties first published by Trotsky, the existence of which was then denied by our truthful Government, but which, owing to the occasional jars in the allied camp, have now become accepted facts.

Once again the attitude taken up by our party in opposing the gentry of the Labour Party (and all other anti-working class candidates) who batten and fatten on the political ignorance of the working class, is justified.

In connection with the contest just closed at Widnes, the following extract throws a flood of light on the worthless character of the “labour” candidate.

The Liberal Association of the Widnes Division met this evening, and having considered the political situation in reference to the election now pending, passed a resolution recommending the Liberal electors of the division “to vote for the Labour candidate and to support the candidature of Mr. Henderson in every possible way, and thus unite the progressive forces.”—“*Daily News*,” August 20th, 1919.

The workers of Widnes have been asked to vote for this nominee of capitalism, who was prepared to accept office in a capitalist ministry, went to Russia at the time of the collapse of Tsardom to do the bidding of a capitalist government, and at most is prepared, like any Liberal, to tinker with and endeavour to patch

up the awful mess created by capitalist society.

The folly and futility of such procedure has been exposed time and time again, and even Lloyd George himself has said that as soon as one sore is removed another breaks out. Study Socialism, and then vote for it.

THE SCOUT.

## THE STRUGGLE IN U.S.A.

### The Movement of the Blind.

America badly needs a Socialist party. The deep ignorance of the workers here is reflected in the profound ignorance of the organised labour movement. The American Federation of Labour continues on its capitalist road, exchanging thorough support of the war for the enslaving policy of our masters' peace. The Industrial Workers of the World has been paralysed by anti-Syndicalist laws and persecution of its leaders—mostly now in Federal prisons. The Workers' International Industrial Union—the child of the Socialist Labour Party—does not grow, and is always busy with internal fights, especially with its parent, the S.L.P. It refuses to endorse the S.L.P. as more than half its membership belongs to the rotten Socialist Party of America.

### “My Country, 'tis of Thee.”

The war found the S.P. leaders pro-Ally and anxious for the popular side, many getting Government jobs and increased publicity. These leaders seceded or were finally expelled, and they formed the Social Democratic League similar to the Hyndman clique in England. To-day the S.D.L. is little heard of and is represented in print by Allen Benson's paper, “*Reconstruction*.” Rose Pastor Stokes returned to the S.P. fold, while her millionaire husband still continues with the jingoes.

A. M. Simons, when not busy misleading Europe, writes lies for the capitalist Press with Chas. E. Russell, William English Walling, Allan Benson, and John Spargo. They flourish in the pages of that worst of all papers, the “*Appeal to Reason*,” now known as the “*New Appeal*,” of Girard, Kansas.

The leading writer of that journal is Upton Sinclair, who is trying to explain away his jingoism in his monthly magazine, “*The New Justice*,” of Los Angeles.

### Debs and Debsism.

Eugene V. Debs was enthusiastic for the S.P. anti-war stand at the St. Louis Convention in 1916, but began to wobble when America entered the war. In the pages of the “*Social Builder*,” a social reform Magazine of St. Louis, Debs argued that the anti-war stand should be modified, especially in view of the approaching

election. All the capitalist papers reprinted his statements to show that the S.P. was becoming “sane.”

When Debs saw that his new attitude was losing him support he wobbled back to his former position, though at his recent trial he reminded the court that he did not agree with the St. Louis platform. Debs sought to hold his democratic following, and received 10 years at Cleveland Federal Court for speaking against the war at Canton, Ohio. He is now in Atlanta prison.

Kate Richards O'Hare, a reformer and leader of the S.P., is also in prison, though her danger to the ruling class is infinitesimal. Victor Berger, one of the most anti-Socialist leaders of the S.P., has also been given 20 years, though he supported the Mexican War and militarism. He was widely known as a pro-German. While Berger wrote the pro-German articles for the “*Milwaukee Leader*,” Simons did the pro-Ally work on the same periodical.

### The Lawyer Leaders.

Even after many of the openly pro-war gentry had left the party the great bulk of the leadership and many members refused to take the working-class position on the war. The mass of S.P. membership can be estimated by their continual support of the official clique and by their sticking to such a rotten organisation. Morris Hillquit, the “brains of the S.P.,” one of the many lawyers on the National Executive, offered to organise an army of Socialists to help to explain democracy to the Germans overseas. He also admitted that if he had been a member of Congress he would have voted for the war.

Algernon Lee and six other S.P. aldermen voted \$80,000 in New York for a “Victory” arch on which the American “victory” at Murmansk in Russia was inscribed. Louis Boudin—another lawyer, and author of “*Theoretical System of Karl Marx*”—rallied in support of the League of Nations, and refused to adopt any views on the Russian situation as he would not condemn Plechanoff and his other friends thousands of miles away.

### Such a Happy Family!

When Kerensky got control in Russia the S.P. rallied for that capitalist Government, and when Ebert rose to power in Germany they duly celebrated the German “Revolution.” Their support of much A. F. of L. officialdom, the sickening reform programme, the lack of party discipline, the general ignorance of Socialism, caused a growing revolt in certain centres in the States. More than 50 per cent. of the membership is composed of foreign language federations. These have always been

hotbeds of reform propaganda and general ignorance. The Finnish, Jewish, and German federations supported every reactionary policy. Until the Bolshevik uprising in Russia the various Russian federations in the S.P. were small, but they sprang up like mushrooms after the coup of 1917. The Russians wobbled from the defense of Plechanoff to that of Kerensky, and through their ignorance rallied to the policy of S.P. reformism.

The great bulk of Jews in the party read “*Forward*,” the national daily edited by Abe Cahan—the supporter of war and defender of reaction in the party.

Many prominent members of the Socialist Labour Party have climbed back onto the S.P. waggon—Frank Bohn, Louis Fraina, Solon de Leon, Karl Dannenburg, Seidel, Dr. Julius Hammer—and some of them began the contest for leadership in the S.P. They preached Industrial Unionism of a kind, and men like Fraina saw in the rising Bolshevik wave in the party a chance to build up a large following.

### All Aboard for Bolshevism.

One point should be well noted. The elements here who took front rank in their support of Bolshevism were the very ones who were against revolutionary methods and who ridiculed Socialist education. Their feelings ran high when Allied intervention in Russia welded working-class sentiment against the capitalist international. And the anti-political ideas preached for years were good material for “abolish the State immediately” propaganda. Soviet were formed here but were mere parodies of the Russian example. Some, like in Philadelphia, advocated the armed rising of a minority, whilst most of them degenerated into veterans' reform associations.

### The Left Wing and its Feathers.

The Left Wing of the S.P. comprises every variety of fool and freak, just like the Right Wing. There is, however, some good material in the Left Wing, but it is powerless while it remains together with such an army of ignorance. The test question is not whether you understand Socialism and are in favour of it, but whether you are a Bolshevik. And Bolshevism here covers almost every conceivable idea except the scientific principles of Socialism—Mass Action on the streets against machine guns, Minority Rule, To Hell with Democracy, Action not Study, such are some of the ideas of the Left Wing.

The S.P. have suspended seven language federations—Russian, Lithuanian, Lettish, Polish, South Slavic, Ukrainian, and Estonian—on account of their affiliation with the Left Wing



party within the party. The State of Massachusetts and many locals in New York were expelled for the same reason, making nearly half the membership. The State of Michigan was expelled for adopting a "no reform" constitution. Michigan was not affiliated with the Left Wing organisation as they objected to the Mass Action, Industrial Unionist, and other confused ideas preached in the Left Wing manifesto and the Left Wing official organ, the "Revolutionary Age." The support of Michigan only existed where study classes had been organised by Michigan's proletarian university, a Marxian study class-promoting body organised by a number of Detroit workers.

### The Left Wing is in Pieces.

The Socialist Propaganda League was formed in 1916 to preach Industrial Unionism and Mass Action within the S.P. Fraina and S. J. Rutgers (now in Russia), and Bucharin the Bolshevik Commissar, were prominent members. They published the "New International" at Boston, and they eventually merged into the Left Wing group and gave up their paper for the "Revolutionary Age"—a parrot-like edition of Lenin's and Trotsky's speeches. It falsifies Marx and dupes its ignorant following.

All Left Wing branches, locals, and States were invited to send representatives to the Left Wing Convention at New York on June 21st. The Convention was dominated by Jim Larkin, the supporter of Labourism, John Reed, the war correspondent lately returned from Russia, and Louis Fraina, the political gymnast of the S.P., S.L.P., and Socialist Propaganda League. The whole business was a miserable farce, being a sordid struggle for control. The Michigan delegates presented an ultimatum demanding the immediate formation of a Communist party on the basis of a platform adopted by Michigan at its special Convention on June 15th. The Russian federations—the backbone of the Left Wing—also objected to the policy of the Left Wing leaders in trying to capture the rotten S.P. at their coming National Convention on August 30th; the Russians, therefore, wanted to form a Communist party immediately. Thus Michigan found itself withdrawing from the Conference in Company with 30,000 Russian members who would easily dominate Michigan's 6,000. At the time of writing Michigan has been pledged by its delegates to work with the Russian Federations and they have formed the Communist Party. In doing so Michigan has adopted a programme of Mass Action, Industrial Unionism, and "Abolition of the State at Once," but many well-informed members in Detroit are determined to undo this underhand work of the delegates. A. K.

## THE HIRELINGS AT WORK

Manifold are the uses of the labour leader to the capitalist class. When the masters wanted war the decoy ducks received their instructions and Patriotism became their watch-cry. When a strike becomes inconvenient to the masters the "leaders" instruct their men to return to work. Now that the labour situation is becoming somewhat uncomfortable for the employers they send out the cry of "More production or national disaster," and right nobly do the henchmen rally to the call.

To enable the inexperienced reader to appreciate the perfidy of these people it is necessary to set forth a few elementary facts.

The basis of the tactics necessary to achieve Socialism is the understanding of, and acting in accordance with, the class struggle—the recognition of the fact that in present-day society two classes exist whose interests are diametrically opposed: the employing class and the employed class.

The employing class own all the wealth produced, and as there is a limit to the amount of wealth that can be consumed by wage-earners—a limit imposed by the limits of the purchasing power of their wages—so there is a limit to the amount that the markets demand. The greater the speed of production the sooner this limit will be reached. The employed class produce the wealth, and the individuals who compose this class, by the necessities of their existence, are compelled to compete with each other for jobs, and so keep wages down to a certain average level.

As there is a limit to the wealth which the markets can absorb, so there is a limit to the jobs going. The more completely production is organised and the harder the employed class works the sooner the limit to the wealth required will be reached and the sooner a large proportion of the employed will be jobless.

Consequently, the present constitution of society puts the workers in the position that an increase in production, in so far as it signifies an intensification of the productivity of labour, is directly opposed to their interests. Considered in this light, therefore, an increase in production means, in the long run, an increase in wealth to the employers, and an increase in unemployment to the workers.

With the idea of smothering the class war and promoting harmony between exploiter and exploited an alliance has just been formed calling itself the Brittanic Industrial Alliance. The chairman of the Provisional Committee is J. Havelock Wilson. The committee also includes G. N. Barnes, J. R. Clynes, J. Hodge,

and G. H. Roberts. The aims of the organisation are:

"To bring together employers and employees in this country which are now working harmoniously under Whitley Industrial Councils or similar working agreements, and organisations and individuals interested in developing British trade and British interests."—"Daily Chronicle," 1.9.19.

The only weapon the workers have on the industrial field is to be set aside and we are to sweat riches for wasters without a murmur—in the interests of British trade.

In the "Daily News" (28.8.19) we read—

"Mr. W. Adamson, M.P., stated in an interview yesterday that already he had made it clear to the House of Commons that so far as the Parliamentary Labour Party and he were concerned they recognised that there was great need for increased production."

J. T. Brownlie, chairman of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, has issued an appeal to the workers for increased production, and the "Daily Chronicle" (2.9.19) gives a list of "Labour leaders" supporting the appeal. The following paragraph sums up the situation:

"Quite a number of leading officials of the big unions have been interviewed by the "Daily Chronicle" representative, and in every case there was agreement that the grave position of the country demanded more work, and more work."

Speaking in the House on the Consolidated Fund Bill (12.8.19), Mr. Sexton delivered himself of the following gem:

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer, when members on this side were complaining, endeavoured to lay at the door of the working classes of this country the blame for the trouble, because he said the men were not increasing production. I want to subscribe to that."

Of course, the whiskers of the "Socialist" movement, H. M. Hyndman, had to put his spoke in the wheel. He, we learn, had an interview with a "Daily Chronicle" representative, to whom he said (18.8.19):

"Of course there must be increased production. If we had prepared as well for the honors of peace as we did for the honors of war we should not now be in the position we are in to-day."

How well Marx and Engels judged this man half a century ago when they described him as a bourgeois intellectual. For years he has served his class well, reaching the culminating point when he threw all his energies into assisting in the late campaign to smash German

competition and incidentally send millions of the workers to eternity.

At the moment of writing we see Ben Tillet has added his mite to the mess. In an article in "John Bull" (6.9.19) he writes:

"The whole nation is in an ugly mood of sulk and suspicion. The more alert and enterprising countries, like America and Japan, had, prior to the end of the war, prepared a scientific and calculated attack upon our export trade, and our trade generally; while we have reduced our wealth by such immense quantities to the advantage of our Allies in general, and America in particular, that we are economically in a more or less crippled condition. The energy and the organisation of labour and capital, which helped to build our fortune previous to the war, are at the moment viciously and selfishly antagonistic."

"There never was such a chance for recovery as now presents itself—to maintain our position among the nations—and there never was such a moment of peril! Capital and Labour must understand the tremendous obligations of the war, the debts to be paid, the hundred millions to be given to our defenders and their dependents. There is no jugglery in the world to meet these obligations—they must be met by actual effort, and the community owes a debt to the men who braved the fight and the dependents of those who have given their lives. We want virile brains and healthy bodies and happy homes and useful lives—but monopolies, either of Capital or Labour, must go if the country is to live!"

Comment on the above effusion relating to our trade, our wealth, our fortune, our allies, and the debts we owe is needless. It might spoil the beautiful phrases of one of the workers' most contemptible enemies.

Thus do the "labour leaders" echo the cry of the capitalists. Unless we produce more and *compete successfully* (ah! there's the rub!) with other countries, they cry, we will go headlong to ruin. What stronger argument is needed for the abolition of capitalism?

"Labour leaders" are out for pelf and place; they do not advocate the only solution to the working-class sufferings, but seek to conserve the interests of the capitalists by maintaining that more production, more sweating of toilers, will ease the situation.

But already there are thousands who cannot get work, and as long as this is so the words of the Tilletts are known for lies even as they fall from their foul lips—lies intended to wring still greater profits out of those who are fools enough to believe them. G. M.



**OFFICIAL NOTICE.**

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

**TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.**

Twelve Months, post free ...	rs. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " "	9d.

**The Socialist Standard,**

MONDAY, SEPT. 1, 1919.

**THE PINT POT.**

The capitalists are very much concerned just now to teach the workers something of economics—of the capitalist variety, of course. We have before us as we write a whole pile of effusions which have recently appeared in the capitalist Press, or have been let loose upon the workers in the form of capitalist leaflets, to which, in most cases, those who issue them have not the courage to put their names.

Of the latter—the cowardly (cowardly because the issuers shirk the obligation of publicly defending their lying statements)—two of the most ludicrous are entitled “Does Capital Rob Labour?” and “The Soldier’s Return,” respectively. A series of articles from the pen of a Canadian professor now appearing in the “Sunday Express” is a further case in point, while that fine old capitalist servant, Frederic Harrison, issues a touching appeal to labour “leaders” to “make those who look to you for guidance see it [capitalist economics as expounded by F.H.] as clearly as yourselves.”

Most of the literary efforts have one specific object—to induce the workers to produce at a cheaper rate. Thus Frederic Harrison tells us that “slack work releases capital, to go elsewhere,” and also that “higher wages mean rise of prices to the millions,” while the “Star” (September 8th) says “we have got to fill up the pint-pot to the brim before we can get a pint out of it.”

It appears that it is Lord Wrenbury who provides the “pint-pot” simile in a letter to the “Times,” and the “Star” quotes his lordship as saying “If the labourer says he must have a

pint-and-a-half [out of a pint pot] he cannot have it because it is not there to have. If he says he will have a pint he will not get it because the beer will never be brewed if the master brewer is to get no return.” The “Star’s” assertion was thus effectively answered in advance.

Of course ca’canny drops in for it all round. The unfortunate thing about the argument that the less the workers produce the better it is for them is that pushed to extremes it brings us to the proposition that if nobody produced anything the labourer would be in his second Golden Age. The “Star” adopts this line, under disguise when it argues that “if each of us leaves, say, half of his work to be done by others, the total wealth of the country will be half what it might be.” Of course our contemporary fails to see that this depends upon whether or not the work left is done by the others—a point of peculiar interest to those thousands who are unable to get work to do.

The Press may call it a poisonous doctrine that the less work anyone does the more work there is for others to do, but the fact remains. The workers are only paid while they are filling the pint pot. The harder they work, therefore, the sooner it is filled and the fewer are required to fill it. The capitalists would like the analogy of the pint pot to be abandoned at this point, but it is just here that it becomes most interesting to the worker.

John Stuart Mill, the beloved economist of the banking profession, holds that it is capital which presents the limit to production. The pint pot is formed of capital and increases or decreases according as capital is added to or subtracted from its walls. This is a very comfortable theory for bankers, who like to believe that it is capital that makes the world go round. But capital itself is tied up in filling the pint pot—in other words, the master brewer’s pot gets smaller as it gets fuller; he must sell his beer or he will find the put full. And when the pot is full the worker ceases to get anything out of it because he is no longer required to put anything into it. It behoves the worker, therefore, to see that the pot does not get full, by putting into it as little as he can and taking out of it as much as he can.

Nevertheless, it is not in this direction that the worker must expend his main energy. He must see to it that the pot and all he puts into it are his. Then only can he quaff the full pot.

**LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.**  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.  
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

## LEWIS HENRY MORGAN.

### AN ACCOUNT AND APPRECIATION OF HIS LIFE WORK.

The year 1818, which witnessed the birth of Karl Marx, also saw the birth, on Nov. 21st, of Lewis Henry Morgan, a man whose investigations into the nature of primitive human society were as epoch-making as were those of Marx into the structure of modern capitalism. Born at Aurora, Cayuga County, in the State of New York, and of “middle-class” parents, Morgan, after the customary school education, graduated, at the age of 22, at Union College, N.Y. Afterwards he underwent a four years course in law, and in 1844 was admitted to the Bar. In partnership with his old schoolmate, afterwards Judge G. F. Danforth, Morgan practised successfully as a lawyer in Rochester, where he made his home.

**Studies of the Indians.**

While at college young Morgan had become deeply interested in the Red Indians of the Iroquois tribes, the remnants of a once powerful and widespread people, in the State of New York. After his graduation he joined with a number of young enthusiasts in Aurora who, like himself, were fond of Indian lore, forming a club or society which was called the Grand Order of the Iroquois. The “Order,” which was of the nature of a secret society, also appears to have been known as the “Gordian Knot.”

The idea of its founders was to extend the organisation over the tribal territory which the Iroquois in times past had occupied. Branches were to be established wherever a settlement of the Iroquois was known to have existed, and “council-fires” held at night for the discussion of matters relating to the Indians.

In order to study more intimately their life and institutions Morgan actually went into an Iroquois settlement, and there lived as one of themselves for periods which eventually totalled several years. So well did he gain the confidence and affection of the Indians that in 1847 he was permitted to formally enter, by adoption, into the Hawk gens of the Seneca tribe. They recognised in him a fraternal link between the white men and the red, and gave him the name Ta-ya-da-wah-kugh, meaning “one lying across.”

The first results of his investigations Morgan embodied in a series of papers which were read to the “Grand Order,” and also to the New York Historical Society, of which he was a member. Subsequently they were published as “Letters on the Iroquois,” under the pen-name of “Skenandoah” in the “American Review”

during 1847, and later appeared in other journals.

Among Morgan’s closest associates was a pure-blooded Seneca Indian called Ha-sa-no-an-da, who had adopted the English name of Ely S. Parker. He was well educated and a civil engineer by profession. Hasanoanda possessed an exceedingly full knowledge of Iroquois customs and institutions and was himself a Sachem or peace-chief of the Senecas, his name signifying “Keeper of the Western door of the Long House” (see below).

With Parkers’ assistance Morgan was able to carry his researches into the past history of the Iroquois and to complete his first great work on primitive society, “The League of the Iroquois,” which he published in 1851. This book which Morgan, out of recognition for his services, inscribed to Eli S. Parker, was written, as the author says in the preface, “to encourage a kinder feeling towards the Indian founded upon a truer knowledge of his civil and domestic institutions, and of his capabilities for future elevation,” surely, in view of the brutal treatment meted out to the Red-man by the Paleface who had robbed him, a noble ideal.

The first scientific account of an Indian people ever written, this book contains a detailed description based on personal observation of the society, religion, ceremonial, games, art, craftsmanship, and language of the Iroquois. A new edition appeared in 1904.

The league of tribes was the highest type of social organisation achieved by the American Indians. That of the Iroquois was formed in the fifteenth century and consisted of five, and later of six, tribes, the Mohawks, Cayugas, Senecas, Onondagas, and the Tucaroras. The term “Iroquois” is believed to be of French origin. They called themselves Ho-de-no-sau-nee, the “People of the Long House,” the latter allusion being to the Indian communal house which was chosen as the symbol of the League. At the time when Morgan wrote, however, the League was but a shadow of its former self, having lost, with the coming of the Whites, the position which had made it a social and military power of no mean importance.

In 1855 Morgan was concerned in an engineering scheme to build a railway through the wilderness of North Michigan, and in conjunction therewith performed some practical exploration which was much needed in this, at that time, little known region. When thus engaged he made some original investigations into the social habits and constructive ability of the beaver, an animal which was exceedingly abundant in this area. His results were embodied in “The American Beaver and His Works,” published in 1867. One of the most perfect



of zoological monographs, this work drew praise from Darwin, although he considered that Morgan had underestimated the power of instinct and thus rated too highly the reasoning powers of the beaver.

In 1856 Morgan made the acquaintance of Prof. Henry, of the Smithsonian Institute, and of Agassiz, the famous American naturalist, both of whom encouraged him to continue his unique Indian studies.

#### Studies in Kinship and Sex Relations.

While on a visit in 1858 to Marquette on Lake Superior, one of the termini of the proposed railway, Morgan visited a camp of the Ojibwa tribe and there discovered the same peculiar system of recognising family relationships which he had found among the Iroquois. According to this system a man referred to the children of his brothers as his own "sons" and "daughters," and all these "cousins" as they would be termed by us, called one another "brother" or "sister." Likewise with the children of several sisters.

The discovery that this system existed among the Ojibwa appears to have been somewhat of a revelation to Morgan, and he now pursued his ethnological researches with redoubled vigour, visiting in the next three or four years different tribes in the extreme West and as far North as Canada. He found, as he had begun to expect, that the same system of kinship was characteristic of practically all the tribes in North America.

After this Morgan, with the assistance of the United States Government, carried his investigations into other lands. Carefully prepared lists of questions were forwarded to officials, explorers, and missionaries in different parts of the world. Most of these lists were returned with the desired information, and by this means Morgan was successful in acquiring a vast amount of data bearing on the sex relations and kinship of numerous peoples the world over.

It was a stupendous task to sort out and classify this mass of evidence, but Morgan performed it with great ability and remarkable results. These were set forth in a preliminary essay published in the "Proceedings of the American Academy of Sciences" in 1868.

The complete and tabulated results of these investigations appeared in the "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family," published in 1871 as Vol. XVII. of the "Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge" by the "Institute." This work, containing as it does the kinship systems of one hundred and thirty-nine distinct peoples comprising about four-fifths of the human race, is one of the land-

marks of ethnology and denoted the entry of exact scientific method into the study of primitive society.

Frederick Engels in his "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," thus summarises Morgan's conclusions:

(1) The kinship system of the American Indians is also in vogue in Asia, and in a somewhat modified form among numerous tribes of Africa and Australia.

(2) This system finds a complete explanation in a certain form of communal marriage now in process of decline in Hawaii and some Australian islands.

(3) By the side of this marital form, there is in practice on the same islands a system of kinship only explicable by a still more primeval and now extinct form of communal marriage.

Morgan was led by his researches to the belief that unrestricted sexual intercourse had been the habit of primeval mankind. Progressive restriction upon intercourse between near blood relatives then resulted in two successive forms of group or communal marriage in which a group of men were common husbands to a similar group of women. This custom, by rendering actual fatherhood uncertain, necessarily resulted in the tracing of descent through females only, a fact which had already been inferred by Bachofen in his "Mother Right" (1861) from a study of classical mythology.

Further restriction led to a loose "pairing family"—the intercourse and co-habitation of one man with one woman—and then, as Morgan subsequently showed, the rise of private property formed the basis of the historical form of monogamy, with its permanent union and male inheritance.

In treating anomalous kinship-systems as the vestiges of extinct marital and family institutions, and in coming forth as the ethnological champion of the theory of original promiscuity and of group marriage, Morgan encountered the opposition of the "established school" of anthropologists led McLennan. Just as Owen, Virchow, and other reactionary scientists endeavoured to save the "respectability" of mankind by denying, in opposition to the Darwinians, our animal ancestry, so Westmarck, Andrew Lang and others fitted bourgeois morality upon the primitive savage by declaring, against Morgan and even Lubbock, that human sex-intercourse had never been promiscuous and that monogamy was its "natural" and original form.

Morgan's views on this matter have, in the main, been amply vindicated by the more recent painstaking researches of Spencer and Gillen into the communal marriage systems of the Australian aborigines.

#### The Roots of Cultural Progress.

After the publication of his "Systems of Consanguinity" Morgan pursued the investigation of several series of facts which had attracted his attention whilst accumulating the materials for that important work.

The only literary fruits of his work during the following five or six years were a number of essays on the ancient culture of Central America—a line of enquiry which greatly interested him. Between 1869 and 1876 there appeared in the form of magazine articles "The Seven Cities of Chibola," "Montezuma's Dinner," and "The Houses of the Mound Builders."

Morgan was something of a classical scholar, and it gradually became apparent to him that there was a more intimate affinity between the social institutions of early Greece and Rome and those of existing barbarian peoples than was usually supposed.

He also became aware of the great changes wrought in social and cultural institutions by progressive improvements in man's means of living.

Thus by a variety of channels he arrived at the conception of the essential unity in the course and method of evolution throughout the entire human race. The great antiquity and animal origin of mankind had already been established, but little knowledge had as yet been gained as to the social conditions of existence among primitive men.

Morgan was among the first to scientifically penetrate into the social status of man in the stages preceeding the patriarchal system which, in conformity with Hebrew tradition, most earlier writers, even the learned Sir Henry Maine ("Ancient Law," Chap. 5), had considered to be the dawn of society.

In 1877 Morgan gave to the world the result of forty years study in his chief literary work, "Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilisation." The book is divided into four parts. In the first Morgan shows that the basis of all human progress lies in the discovery or invention of artificial aids to existence in the form of implements and technical processes, and that these processes lead to new methods of living, generating new needs and producing a gradual increase in man's knowledge of and control over natural forces.

The author divides the evolution of mankind into seven stages, each marked off by outstanding discoveries. Thus the lowest or first stage in the period of savagery commences with man, hardly differentiated from the rest of the anthropoid stock, existing as a tropical tree-dweller and consuming raw roots, fruits, and small

animals. During this period the first simple form of language was developed and rude tools of stone, shell, bone, and similar materials began to be used.

Then came the making of fires, which made cooking possible and raised man to the second stage of Savagery. Fishing was now adopted and by encouraging migrations along river banks and coasts assisted in the dispersal of the race over the continents. The invention of the bow and arrow ushers in the third stage, in which the savage was equipped for the hunting of large game.

With the art of making pottery the period of Barbarism begins. In its first stage crude picture-writing and probably weaving were evolved. Primitive agriculture commenced towards the close of this period. Then with the domestication of cattle, sheep, and other hoofed animals in the Eastern Hemisphere and the improvement of agriculture in Central and South America, the middle stage of Barbarism would be reached. This period, in its use of the softer metals, corresponds with the Bronze Age of the archaeologists.

The upper status of Barbarism was reached only in the Eastern Hemisphere when iron smelting was achieved. This great discovery, which placed in man's hands the means of procuring tools of great hardness and durability, gave an unprecedented impetus to agriculture and other forms of production. The invention of alphabetic writing closed the epoch of Barbarism and ushered in the era of written history—of Civilisation.

Morgan's orderly classification of the cultural history of mankind was a marked advance upon all previous attempts. It is still, over forty years after its formulation, recognised as the most adequate and useful of the many schemes which have been evolved (see article "Civilisation," Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition).

To Socialists Morgan's classification is especially of interest inasmuch as it is based upon the principle that "the great epochs of human progress have been identified, more or less directly, with the enlargement of the sources of subsistence" ("Ancient Society," p 19), a thesis fundamentally identical with the Materialist Conception of History of Marx and Engels.

R. W. HOUSLEY.

(To be Concluded.)

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.



## ON TRIVIALITIES.

Though, of course, the capitalist system is inexorably doomed to perish as other systems have perished, its longevity is considerably aided by the ignorance and gullibility of the working class. The capitalist class, naturally enough, are only too ready to seize upon the undiscerning working-class brain and to chloroform and cloud it with "stunts" worked up by the Press. And we find that even as late as this in the world's history the fetish of Royalty still serves the turn of the masters as a means of keeping the mind of the proletarian from considering and endeavouring to eradicate the system of slavery and misery which exists to-day. Thus you find that the Press is full of articles and photographs concerning the tour of the Prince of Wales, who we are told is engaged in the "unification of the Empire"—whatever that may mean."

We have no quarrel with any individual whatsoever: our quarrel is with the capitalist system. Though the actions of this particular young man have figured largely in the Press for some years we know for what reason he exists. And we know that as soon as the capitalist system has no longer need of kings and princes they will cease to function as such. Therefore we are not concerned with them. We are not, on that account, prepared, like some, to argue that a certain "scion of a noble house" did not go "over the top" times out of number. Personally we Socialists see no reason why he should not! He is a capitalist and performs a definite function in the system of capitalism, and the war was fought in the interests of capitalism. What we do object to is that millions of other young men, but of the working class, went "over the top" times out of number, and we see no reason why they should!

But you will find pseudo-Socialists and red-flag waggons howling themselves hoarse upon any event that happens along, imagining that they are helping along the consummation of Socialist teaching, when all the time they are only serving to perpetuate the present system by keeping the minds of the working class focussed upon its trivialities. Which is just what the capitalist class desire.

On the other hand, the Socialist does not fill the columns of his Press with diatribes against "profiteers," Royalty, and the like, and eulogies of Bolsheviks, "simple-lifers," or others. He just, all the time and every time, uses his energy and his ink in showing the workers wherein lies their salvation from the poverty and misery that is their lot.

Thus we tell the working class that the capitalist system is served as well by a descrip-

tion of the Empire tour of the Prince of Wales in the "Express" as by an outburst against the menu of the Ritz Hotel in the columns of a "Labour" paper, and we warn them not to waste time in discussing either; but to concern themselves only with the abolition of the existing system of society. All else is of no account.

The main object of the worker should be to achieve his emancipation, and to do that he needs must think clearly. But so long as his brain is switched from one passing phase to another by jingo "stunts" or labour "stunts" he will remain the slave he is to-day.

S. H. S.

## THE PASSING OF A BRAIN-SUCKER.

On the 12th of August the death of Andrew Carnegie was reported, and all the capitalist newspapers united to diffuse an odour of sanctity around the man whose fortune—like all other great fortunes—was built up by the sucking of other men's brains.

It was on the shoulders of others that Carnegie climbed to affluence. Unscrupulous, alike in his dealings with his fellow capitalists and his workmen, he crushed out all who stood in his path, until he came up against a more powerful combination than his own, then he stepped quietly down and out of business, leaving Morgan, Rockefeller & Co. a clear field.

Carnegie came at the first flush of the era of speculation and "high finance" in America, and the tide swept him along with it. The keystone of his success was his ability in appropriating the product of other men's brains (as well, of course, as the product of their hands), or, as he himself repeatedly expressed it in relation to his managers, finding better men to look after his interests.

The man who is set up as a model of "self-help" was helped by others all his life. The only direction in which he exercised self-help was in helping himself to the product of the work of others.

A quotation from the full-page effusion on Carnegie's life in the "Daily Telegraph" (Aug. 12th) gives in a nutshell the story of his life and the cause of his success.

He began the world without a penny. He retired from business sixty years after one of the richest men in the world—to put it no higher—with a fortune of some £90,000,000. . . . It was won by a man who had no training for his life-work. The greatest of iron masters knew nothing of metallurgy.

(Italics mine.) No money—no knowledge of iron—yet the greatest iron master! How did he do it?

To the progress of the industrial revolution, to the stupendous development of mechanical and scientific methods in manufacture, Andrew Carnegie owed his millions.

Here we have it. Carnegie's wealth was built up by the ingenious brains and hands of working men. In other words, the departed saint stole the product of others' toil. And what of the workers and thinkers whose discoveries brought about the industrial revolution? The main figures in it—Crompton, Cartwright, Stephenson, Kay, Jacquard, Harrington, Lavoisier, Koenig, Roberts, Trevithick, Gutenberg, Cart, Bourseul, and a host of others, either died in poverty after lives of struggle against starvation, or—in the case of a very few—gained a niggardly recognition when they were on the brink of the grave.

Now let us see where the self-help came in. Carnegie's first "start" in life was due to another person. To quote again from the "Daily Telegraph":

And now came the tide in Carnegie's life which, taken at the flood, led on to fortune. . . . It was Col. Scott who first taught the youth how to make money earn more money. . . . His mother mortgaged their house, into which had gone all the family savings. With the \$600 thus raised Andrew bought Adams Express Stock, on his astute employer's advice.

Of course the stock paid well: Scott was in the "swim."

Carnegie's next step was to introduce to the Pennsylvania Railroad, through the agency of Scott (who was president of the company) T. T. Woodruff's invention of a sleeping berth (the forerunner of the Pullman car). He borrowed the money for his shares, and was "let in on the ground floor," "but the cars afterwards paid handsome dividends!" "Thus," he wrote, "did I get my foot on fortune's ladder. It was easy to climb after that."

Thus did he vindicate the glorious principle of self help! I may add that I find no record of Woodruff's name as one of those who got their feet on fortune's ladder. No doubt he went the usual way of inventors.

During the Civil War Carnegie's pal Scott (now Assistant Secretary for War) found him a lucrative job in the service of the Northern wage slave owners, and at the conclusion of the war he utilised the wealth he had acquired to go in for oil and "struck it rich."

Like Mr. Rockefeller, he was in at the start. In 1862, with several associates, he purchased the Storey farm, on Oil Creek, Pennsylvania, for \$40,000. It proved what prospectors call a bonanza, and in one year paid \$1,000,000 in cash dividends.

Having gained the early plums of the oil trade, the "self-made man" in the making turned his attention to steel. On a visit to England he saw the steel rails that were the result of the

new Bessemer process (a process discovered by one of Bessemer's workmen whose name even is not known!) introduced them into America, and another chunk was added to his fortune.

The progress of the Trust in which Carnegie had the preponderating influence was largely due to the valuable patents which they controlled. The men who were responsible for the subjects of these patents, however, were but pawns in the hands of the financiers.

Working men have proverbially short memories, yet the name "Homestead" should suffice to recall to the mind the bludgeoning and shooting of working men that took place at Carnegie's works during the "Homestead" strike, when Pinkerton and his gunmen were called in. Though daily waxing richer Andrew the philanthropist (!) was not satisfied, and laid plans to increase the working hours. The men organised to resist the project, so he retaliated by refusing to employ any but non-union workers. According to the "Telegraph" "the strike was soon the crux of one of the ugliest scenes in all the bloodstained history of American labour quarrels." The military (to the number of some 8,000 soldiers) were eventually sent to the vampire's assistance "to restore order"! And such was the man who professed to be the ardent anti-militarist and apostle of peace, and who presented to the world the "Palaces of Peace." Like others of his kidney, he did not want war when it interfered with his accumulation of wealth, but when it suited his purse (as when he took part in the Civil War) his objections vanished.

By the irony of circumstance, the same day the papers were applauding the incarnation of self help and genius in the shape of Carnegie, they devoted a few lines to recording the tragic death of poor Blakelocke, the American landscape painter. His life "was the story of genius doomed to poverty," says the "Evening News" (13.8.19). His greatest works were sold by him for a few paltry pounds to keep his wife and family from starvation. The same works were afterwards sold for hundreds of pounds. The same paper further states: "Worry and the hard struggle for existence eventually produced a break-down, and he was removed to an asylum."

Blakelocke is now looked upon as one of the greatest landscape painters of America, but his genius only brought him poverty and the lunatic asylum.

What a contrast! The unscrupulous and slimy Carnegie dies in the midst of vast riches, while the fine artist dies in the asylum! Self-help, forsooth!

After officially stepping out of business (although still drawing his dividends), Carnegie



set out to make a name for himself in a new direction. He made arrangements to distribute libraries in various places to assist in the education of working men. It appears strange that one who was such a determined antagonist of his employees should suddenly blossom forth as their benefactor. The strangeness, however, disappears as soon as we look below the surface. Carnegie and his class require workpeople who have sharp brains and a good technical knowledge, as these make the most efficient wage-slaves—hence the library stunt.

Since 1901 Carnegie has been throwing millions away and doing his damndest to spend his money, but all to no purpose: he died worth nearly as much as in 1901! What a power of wealth this one man must have robbed the workers of, and yet they try to kid us that we do not produce enough!

Away with dreams and delusions; let us wake up and produce for ourselves. Perish the parasites and vampires. GILMAC.

### OUR £1,000 FUND. ELEVENTH LIST.

Already acknowledged	-	-	£404	14	11½
Balance from Social	-	-	12	16	10
"Sixpenny Collection" Tickets	-	-	9	6	
Islington Branch	-	-	1	5	0
Hackney "	-	-	1	0	0
Tottenham "	-	-	10	0	
Sheet 228, C. Parker, West Ham	-	-	1	0	8
" 56, H.K. and C.W.	-	-	6	0	
H. J. Mills, late Canada	-	-	1	0	0
V. W., Lr. Broughton, Manchester	-	-	1	0	0
F. J. Smith, Harringay	-	-	9	0	
F. Adams	-	-	5	0	
H. Baker	-	-	5	0	
F.E., Queen's Rd. Meeting	-	-	1	0	
Wm. Gill, Edmonton	-	-	1	0	

Total £425 3 11½

### S. P. G. B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR AUGUST. LONDON DISTRICT.

#### Sundays:

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.  
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.  
Finsbury Park, 6 p.m.  
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.  
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.  
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7.30 p.m.

#### Mondays:

Tollington Rd., Holloway Rd. (near Nag's Head), 8.

#### Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

#### Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

#### Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

#### Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

## THE LABOUR COLLEGE. OUR CRITICISM "ANSWERED."

In the May issue of this journal I dealt with certain statements which appeared in the "Plebs Magazine" for April. Among these was a long paragraph by Mr. W. W. Craik, in which he attempts to explain the meaning of capital. As that paragraph was misleading I pointed out where it was wrong and gave a definition of capital more in accordance with Socialist knowledge and principle. An anonymous writer in the July issue of the "Plebs" attempts to rescue Mr. Craik from the results of his ignorance of Socialist economics by declaring that the definition used by him was that of an opponent which he was endeavouring to ridicule. I give here the writer's remarks.

The May number of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, the organ of that truculent band of last-ditchers, the S.P.G.B., contained an article entitled "Economics at the Central Labour College," which was full to overflowing of instructive and edifying information. It was signed "F.F." Whether those initials stood for Fearful Fool or Funny Fellow we are unable, except on the evidence of the article itself, to conjecture. Give ear:—

The mistaken notions of the S.W. miners and the Liberal politics of the Labour Party form the basis of the College instruction, which is carried back to the T.U. and I.L.P. branches as independent and scientific knowledge of the working-class position.

Comment [on which would only spoil its touching simplicity. We quote it to show how much the man who wrote it is in touch with the world outside his hermitage.

"F.F." has also something to say about W. W. Craik's article in the April "Plebs," the unsoundness and anti-Marxian character of the economic views expressed in which are duly exposed. As thus:

Mr. W. W. Craik, dealing with the Coal Commission, asks a simple question in economics—"What is Capital?" But although economics is an important subject at the College, and a correct definition of capital is very essential to that subject, the writer seems quite unable to give one. "What is capital?" he asks. "Wealth used to produce more wealth," he replies.

And then follows a criticism of this alleged "reply"! This is a new method of controversy indeed! I quote some ridiculous remark made by an opponent, and instantly a high-browed S.P.G.B.'er leaps up and accuses me of having uttered the very nonsense which I am doing my best to ridicule! "F.F." should read articles before he reviews them. He might then save himself some time which he could devote to the study of Marx. That he stands in some need of such a course of study is fairly evident from his assertion that capital is a thing, and that the source of capitalist power is the political machinery.

In Mr. Craik's article there is no mention of opponents. The definition is imputed to no one; it is not in quotes, nor is it questioned by Mr. Craik. He says: "But does not capital make

some of this wealth possible? Does it not contribute to the creation of value? What is capital? Wealth used to produce more wealth! That does not tell us much, not even who produces it."

Such a definition is a favourite one with anti-Socialists because it includes practically all wealth, and makes the wage worker a capitalist by virtue of his tools. If Mr. Craik disagreed with it why did he repeat the fallacy in another form, and in the same paragraph? He said:

"Capital is the ownership of labour, the ownership of the labour of yesterday and of to-day, of the labour materialised in the pit props, the steel cage, the winding engine, and of the living labour which sets all in motion and embodies itself in the saleable product coal, in the value and price of coal and, therefore, in the forms of revenue which are derived from value—the wages of the labourer, the profits of the coal-owner and coal merchant, and the royalties of the landowner."

In this sweeping definition, which is undoubtedly the product of Mr. Craik's brain, all wealth is included, with the exception of virgin soil, undiscovered minerals, and such other forms of natural wealth not yet appropriated or transformed by the application of human energy. Mr. Craik's champion says that "F.F." should really read articles before he reviews them. From the foregoing it will be seen that it is Mr. Craik's apologist who does not read his articles. Instead, he indulges in silly guesses as to whether "F.F." stands for Fearful Fool or Funny Fellow—all in the name of education.

Following on his remark about reading articles before reviewing them, the writer of the "Plebs Bookshelf" says: "He [the present writer] might then save himself some time which he could devote to the study of Marx. That he stands in some need of such a course of study is fairly evident from his assertion that capital is a thing, and that the source of capitalist power is the political machinery."

This statement at once puts the Labour College out of all decent discussion. To deliberately misquote an opponent is not only contemptible, it is an admission of a bad case. Below is the paragraph referred to as it appeared in the May "S.S."

"Now it must be obvious that capital is something that is owned, and not the act of ownership, and Mr. Craik is only adding to the confusion that already prevails when he tells the "Plebs" readers that capital is the ownership of pit props, winding gear, machinery, etc. Adam Smith's definition that capital is 'wealth used for the production of profit' is a far more scientific one, and always good enough for the

Socialist, because it can easily be shown that there are no profits without exploitation."

It will at once be seen that the Labour College prefers to misrepresent its opponents rather than admit itself in the wrong or attempt to discuss the question at issue with the object of ascertaining the truth. The lack of understanding and the confusion of the workers to-day is largely due to false or ill-considered definitions of economic terms. Nowhere is this more forcibly shown than in the works of Marx. In every chapter of "Value, Price, and Profit" economic errors like that of Mr. Craik are exposed, and in simple language Marx shows that there is no need for fantastic hypotheses, the Socialist philosophy being built entirely on facts.

Similarly, there is no need to draw conclusions from anything but facts, with regard to the inference of the Labour College that the source of capitalist power is not the political machinery. What is power? The control of physical force. What physical force do the workers control that is at all comparable with the armed forces controlled through Parliament by the capitalist class?

The Industrial Unionists and Direct Actionists have been repeatedly challenged to show how the workers can overcome the organised forces that are used against them by the ruling class. The only reply vouchsafed is to ridicule the notion that the armed forces will be used, or to assert that the soldiers will not shoot, or to claim that they will be Industrial Unionists too, or other nonsense of that kind. But they never attempt to meet the Socialist argument that the workers, possessing as they do, the majority of the votes, can, by organising as a political party, capture Parliament and control the armed forces, as a first step towards expropriating the capitalist class and establishing Socialism.

But the Labour College is not alone in denying the political character of the class struggle. The numerous adventurers in the trade union movement advocating what is called "Direct Action," all claim that the working class can afford to ignore the political fight. Though none of them ever produce a single argument that would justify its adoption by the workers as a means to their emancipation. They are thus the best friends of the ruling class because they persuade the workers to continue their present fruitless struggles on the industrial field, while leaving the real power in the hands of their masters.

The South Wales Miners in particular are enamoured of this doctrine, and in small matters affecting their working conditions have carried it further than most trade unionists. But on



questions where the mine owners have elected to oppose them they have been no more successful than other sections of the workers.

Notwithstanding the repeated failures of the strikes to effect anything of importance for them, they cling to it and use it more frequently than most workers, as a weapon against the master class. But frequently as they are in collision with the masters, they have not yet learned that the forces that beat them in every strike are placed under capitalist control by their votes. They still continue to vote Liberal and Liberal-Labour, thus placing in the hands of their enemies or their agents, the power that defeats them on the industrial field.

This wooden-headed policy is applauded by the Labour College because the South Wales Miners is one of the two unions that owns that institution, and, as Philip Snowden once said in connection with the I.L.P. in similar circumstances, "those who pay the piper call the tune." The "Plebs Magazine" for December 1916 says "The Central Labour College is owned and controlled by the South Wales Miners and the National Union of Railwaymen." But this in itself would not justify me saying, as I did in the May "S.S." "The mistaken notions of the South Wales Miners, and the Liberal politics of the Labour Party, form the basis of the College instruction, which is carried back to the trade union and I.L.P. branches as independent and scientific knowledge of the working-class position. Thus neither the College nor unions can get beyond the compromising and reform attitude of the Labour Party."

What does justify the statement is the fact that the pages of the "Plebs Magazine" are almost entirely devoted to the advocacy of ideas that dominate that union. The "Plebs" is an organ for advertising the methods of the South Wales Miners, and the College is an institution that confirms them in their sterile methods by educating new misleaders on the lines of the old.

If the Labour College wants to prove that it is a genuine working-class institution, established for the purpose of giving the working class a sound knowledge of their slave position in capitalist society, their writers will need to do something more than refer to our indictment as "touching simplicity." Before they can justify their pretension to be an educational centre, fitting the working class for its historic mission—the abolition of class rule and the establishment of Socialism—they must not only understand Socialism themselves: they must unlearn the fraudulent practice of making statements they cannot prove, and denying truths merely because they are unpleasant to them or their supporters.

F. F.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156, High St

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 182 Vol. 16.]

LONDON OCT, 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

## IF YOU WORK HARDER--

YOU "WANT" WORK SOONER.

Fellow Workers, during the months that followed August 1914 you were the objects of persistent appeals from your rulers. Posters

everywhere proclaimed that **As it Was** your king and country needed you. "Your country is in danger," "Every fit man wanted," **in the** you. **Beginning.** was placarded from end to end

of the country. You responded to the call in your thousands. The thought of invading armies desecrating the sacred soil of "your country"; the thoughtfulness of your employers, who agreed to "set you free"; and the jeers of your shopmates who were "too old to go," were some of the reasons that constrained you.

As time passed and the danger that threatened "your country" increased, the call for more of you became more clamorous, and soon it ceased to be a call and you were peremptorily ordered to go. The passing of the Conscription Act proved to you that you were not "free citizens of a free country," but slaves to a master class who owned all the wealth you produced, and the land with all its wealth-producing resources and materials they called "your country."

That class harnessed your wives and children to the wheels of industry, and used you as a "providential fire screen" to protect them and

their possessions from the onslaught of the German workers, driven, like you, to fight out the quarrels of these two sections of the

same master class.

It was their quarrel, but you made up the bulk of the fighting forces. You suffered the hardships, the terrors, the wounds, and saw the open graves filled with the battered corpses of men and boys of your class, when they were

not left to rot on the desolate fields between you and those who had no quarrel with you.

It was not your quarrel, neither is the victory yours. True, you have driven "the enemy" from allied territory. True, you have forced him to capitulate, and your masters have dictated terms of peace. But the victory is theirs, not only over the

**The Workers** Germans, but over your class. Your class, that by **are** its industry and intelligence **Defeated.** has built the mighty fabric

of civilisation, suffered the shame and ignominy of defeat when it surrendered to the call of a false patriotism, and shared with the master class the responsibility for the world war.

True, capitalism breeds wars, but you support capitalism; you build empires for your masters when you might take possession of the earth and build a commonwealth for yourselves—a Socialist commonwealth, where profits no longer would be the object of production, and markets would cease to be a bone of contention for snarling groups of profit-hungry capitalists, but a system wherein free men and women produce wealth according to their needs.

But you, fellow workers, have turned away your heads from Socialism, because your masters and their agents, fearing it, have lied to you about its meaning. They lie from the Press, the platform, and the pulpit. They encourage

labour misleaders to misconstrue, **You** defame, and slander. They dare **Swallow** not meet its exponents in your **It.** presence. Hence you give your

lives to the support of capitalism, and capitalism breeds war with its awful destruction and waste of the wealth which you produce, but do not own. Whether you return as victors or vanquished it is your lot to



replace the wasted wealth and restore the credit of your masters. In their candid moments they told you that it was a business war, waged for markets, and that victory would mean success over Germany. Now they have to confess that victory has not done the trick, that the markets still have to be won by your efforts and sacrifice on the industrial field.

In 1914 your masters appealed to you as "patriots" to save "your country" from the fury of their enemies. To-day in flaring posters on the same hoardings they beg you to save "your country" from bankruptcy. Greater production, they tell you, is necessary, and that is where you come in. They call on you to put your backs into it because you are the only producing class. Without an increase in the aggregate wealth your class, they say, must suffer deeper extremes of poverty. But is it an increase in the aggregate wealth your masters want? No, for if it were they would set the unemployed to work instead of increasing their numbers by wholesale dismissals weekly. Prices are high, they tell you, because there is a real shortage of wealth—of the necessities of life. If this is true why are there unemployed? Because your masters are not concerned with increasing the total quantity of wealth; their desire is for more surplus-value, i.e., the difference between the wealth you produce and the wages you receive. All the wealth you produce belongs to your masters. Your wages are paid out of that wealth, and are determined by what it costs you to live. What they ask from you is more work from the individual worker, in order that the total wages bill can be reduced, the very conditions that have always made for increased unemployment. All the lying agents of the master class are denying this obvious truth day after day, hoping, by constant repetition, to make you believe what they have not yet advanced a scrap of evidence to support, or a single reason on which to base their denial.

The history of capitalism is a continuous record of increasing unemployment, due to the fact that you, by improved means and methods, and by greater effort and efficiency, have periodically produced more wealth than the world's markets could absorb. For the last hundred years industry has been made up of recurring periods of prosperity, crisis and stagnation. But even during the most prosperous times, from one period to another, the unemployed have steadily increased; while each recurring period of crisis has brought the world nearer to an utter collapse of the system by reason of the wholesale bankruptcies and the enormous increase in unemployment.

During all that period your insecurity and poverty have increased, and the story of your

wretchedness is plainly told in the struggles of you and your forebears to snatch from your oppressors the right to enjoy a little more of the wealth you produce. Why in the past have you suffered poverty and starvation while your masters have vainly tried to unload the wealth you have produced on a glutted market? Why, to-day, do the prices of necessities leave no margin to your wages in spite of the increases advertised by the lying capitalist Press? These are questions you may well ask yourselves at the present moment, when your hypocritical masters tell you—the only wealth producers—that unless you work harder and faster there are hungry times ahead for you. Capitalism has never meant anything else for you.

Whether you work harder or try to slack your lot will be poverty in ever deeper shades. If you strike you bring down fresh hardships on your fellow workers, but if you do not strike your masters will reward your cowardice or patriotism, whichever you choose to call it—with reduced wages and a harsher tyranny of supervision, in their greed for more surplus-value. If you consent to be wooed by their profit sharing and piecework promises, you will discover, too late, that their promises are the bait concealing a new bondage, more exacting and pitiless than any in the history of slave systems.

If you rely on the Government's schemes of reconstruction, in your simplicity believing in their fair promises, they will strengthen the position of their class, and correspondingly weaken the position of your class. If you support the Labour Party, they will sell your support for fat jobs. If you dream that nationalisation will save you you will, when you awake, find yourselves under the rule of the bureaucrat and expert—still wage slaves, exploited in the interest of all capitalists instead of that of a company or trust.

There is not a reform within your reach that can save you from worse degrees of exploitation. The unemployment dole is being reduced and the conditions for obtaining made more stringent. There is no need to pass conscription Acts to forcibly enlist you in the industrial army. You are already there by virtue of your poverty, and must sell your labour-power in order to live.

The means of wealth production are owned by the capitalist or master class, and you are only permitted to produce wealth for them while they can sell at a profit. With modern machinery and methods every nation can produce more wealth than it can dispose of within its own boundaries, and it must find markets for the surplus elsewhere. It was this need for markets that led to the war. But war could not solve the insoluble problem. The world's mar-

## BY THE WAY.

In the early days of the European War there were quite a number of people who ascribed that horror to "secret diplomacy." Among this number were to be found members of the Labour Party. Now, one would therefore imagine that those who were aforesaid so great in their denunciation of this evil thing would shun like the plague contact with anything approaching secret diplomacy. Yet what do we find happens? During Mr. A. Henderson's election campaign at Widnes he let fall a most significant admission, and one that even up to the present moment has not been denied by those those in authority. I reproduce it here.

I will let you into another secret. When I went to Russia I went possessing the power to send the then Ambassador home at the end of the fortnight and take his job at £8,000 a year. I made up my mind that that decision was taken on altogether wrong grounds, and that it would be altogether unfair for me to ask the Ambassador to return home. I wired back to London to suggest that I should return and that he should remain at his post.

—"Daily News," 25th August, 1919.

Strange, indeed, that this piece of secret diplomacy should have been carefully hidden for two years by one who is an alleged opponent of of such devices.

The disposal of army paraphernalia which has recently been taking place throws a little light on the extravagance indulged in by the master class and their agents. At the very time when the whole country has been exhorted to practice a rigid economy our rulers have been flitting about in luxurious motor cars, and wholesale waste has been the order of the day. We read, for instance, that the famous "Red Rolls"—the car used by Mr. Churchill, as Sec. of State for War, has recently been sold for £3,727 10s., and the announcement goes on to state how economy had been the paramount idea in its construction. Lest there might be a doubt about it let me quote—

"The last word in luxury" was the description of the auctioneer. The silver plate flashed in the sunlight and the rich red panels were without a scratch. The interior is inlaid with silver in quartered mahogany.

—"Daily Express," Sept. 11th, 1919.

This is how the government of economy campaigners harmonise precept with practice!

I often wonder whether those heroes who went to the war to make the world safe for democracy and who were promised that on their return a new England would await them—that the old England of the past, with its squalor,

kets are for those who can sell the cheapest. In order that your masters may sell cheaply you must produce cheaply. The capitalists of other countries, realising this, are telling their workers the same fairy tales that your masters are telling you. They are inciting their workers—in the name of the Fatherland and the shades of the nation's heroes—to engage in a new war: the war of factories and markets, in which the cheapest workers will win, for their masters commercial supremacy, for themselves increasing unemployment and falling wages.

And this is the fulfilment of their promises—the "land fit for heroes to live in." Your masters tell you that this must always be your lot, that your share of the wealth you produce can never be more than the slave's portion, and that you must work ever more strenuously even for that. They tell you that industry will not bear the burden of higher wages and improved conditions for you. There is only one answer you can return them: they take two-thirds of the wealth you produce and perform no useful function in society; it is, therefore, they that are a burden on society—on you—and you have no further use for them or their system.

Capitalism fails to give you, who produce all wealth, a secure and comfortable existence, then capitalism must go. With modern means and methods of production wealth can be produced to satisfy the needs of all; but capitalism, with its class ownership of the means of life, and the merchandise character which it imposes upon your labour power, stands in the way.

You must first understand the nature of the obstacle, and then organise politically to remove it. The longer you delay the worse does your condition become. The sooner you commence the task—which can only be performed by you, because you are the class that suffers—the sooner will you enjoy the fruits of your labour under a system where the means of wealth production are the common property of all, used and controlled by all, in the interests of all.

F. F.

## CAN YOU SOLVE THIS?

The productiveness of labour has increased a thousandfold in the last 500 years, yet those who labour are in constant penury and want: Why is it?

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.



anxiety, and wretchedness would have vanished for ever. I recall the poster—the beautiful production of the lithographer—where, in theory, the hard-headed son of toil has a house on the hillside, and he was asked the question: "Isn't this worth fighting for?"

That is the picture. The following, one of many such cases, portrays the facts:

"I have spent my gratuity money in unsuccessful searches for another house, and now I am turned out of this cottage, and my wife and three children are without a home," complains the ex-service man.

This man, whose furniture was piled up in the roadway, was demobilised from the R.M.L.I. and had served in the Gallipoli campaign. In his possession is a document which states:

"It is owing to men like him that our country owes its safety after passing through the trials and hardships of the last four-and-a-half years of war unprecedented in the history of the world."—"Daily News," August 25th, 1919.

This is the reward of faithful service rendered to the capitalist class.

At the British Association Conference at Bournemouth one of the speakers, Professor W. D. Haliburton, declared—"If we wish children to be rickety we should feed them on vegetable margarine. The Government have accumulated large quantities of lanoline, intended originally for lubricating purposes," he continued, "and they sent round to see whether it could be used for margarine. It is not poisonous, but it is absolutely indigestible." ("Daily Express," 11.9.19.)

This new "margarine" should prove a two-fold blessing to the capitalist class, for in dispensing it to their slaves the latter will be able to apply it internally or externally as occasion requires. It should prove a good speeder-up.

To those members of the working class who support capitalism the following should be of interest, and one would hope give them cause to halt and think. Mr. Basil Mathews, speaking at the International Conference on Religion and Labour in Browning Hall a short time since said—

In the cotton mills of Japan women worked on an indentured system of four years. Out of every hundred women who entered those mills only twenty got back to their homes. The large majority died because of the conditions in which they worked, or were living immoral lives in order to escape from the mills. The cotton goods thus produced were drenched in the blood of Japanese women.—"Daily News," Sept. 4th, 1919.

In another journal the same gentleman writes of the conditions under which these women labour and he says:

... few can stand the strain for more than one year; disease, especially consumption, is rife among them, and many seek escape from the misery of factory life by becoming prostitutes or maids in dubious tea houses.—"Reynolds's," Sept. 14th, 1919.

The same old story of the capitalists' greed for profit the world over. Fellow worker, are you assisting the master class by supporting their system of slavery, which means hellish conditions for those of your class, or are you joining up with your fellows to abolish it? Think it over.

THE SCOUT.

### THE "FUTURIST."

The notorious Welsh prophet is again at work. Those he represents are crying out for increased production, as their palms are itching for increased profit. Now that the smashing of heads and disembowelling of bodies has slackened down, each section of the master class is eager to obtain the cream of the markets.

On behalf of the British section of the international capitalist class, Lloyd George, the example par excellence of the political dodgery brigade, steps forward to try and persuade the workers that their interests are identical with the interests of the masters—that we must "all pull together" to oust foreign competitors (including "our" late much-esteemed allies, America, France, and Japan!) and to usher in a wonderful new world.

In his touching anxiety to get his valuable (!) views before us Lloyd George has established a new paper called "The Future" which is being distributed free (he evidently fears we should not be sufficiently interested to buy it). The third page contains "The Prime Minister's Message to the People" in bold type as follows:

"Millions of gallant young men have fought for the new world. Hundreds of thousands died to establish it. If we fail to honour the promises given to them we dishonour ourselves."

If the returned soldiers were asked what the new world was going to be like they would doubtless reply "a world of unemployment," judging from the fact that thousands of them can't get jobs. Their position has become so acute that the Government, to save its face, has to publish an appeal on behalf of the King to employers to give discharged and demobilised soldiers the preference over others. This, of course, would not materially alter the case, as it would merely result in the "others" being unemployed, and of such would their new world consist.

How well Lloyd George's Government is treating the dependents of those who "died to

establish" the new world may be judged from the following:

The pathetic circumstances of a soldier's widow, with nine children, who had to apply for out relief in consequence of a refusal by the Ministry of Pensions to allow her more than 6s. 10d. a week was strongly commented on at the East Preston (Sussex) Guardians yesterday.

It was stated that the husband was discharged from the Army in May, 1918, owing to shrapnel wounds. After being operated on nine times he returned to his home at Durrington last October, and died four days later from influenza and pneumonia.

—"Daily News," 3.9.19.

This is only one of numberless similar cases.

Such is Lloyd George's idea of rewarding the heroes and honouring the "promises given."

When he was speaking at Birmingham on Oct. 22nd, 1906, he said in effect that if the conditions that gave rise to the complaint of "slums, pauperism and great want in a land of plenty" were not removed within three years the party he belonged to would deserve to go, and a new movement would grow up to displace the "Liberal bunglers and rogues." Writing now of the period immediately preceding the war (nearly eight years after he made the above-mentioned statement) while he was still the leading light of the Liberal party, he goes on to say in his "message":

What does a new world mean? What was the old world like? It was a world where toil for myriads of honest workers, men and women, purchased nothing better than squalor, penury, anxiety, and wretchedness—a world scarred by slums and disgraced by sweating, where unemployment thro' the vicissitudes of industry brought despair to multitudes of humble homes; a world where, side by side with want, there was waste of the inexhaustible riches of the earth, partly through ignorance and want of forethought, partly through entrenched selfishness.

Out of his own mouth the humbug stands condemned. His delightful future world is always a world the workers will never reach, if he can prevent it.

But let me quote the remainder of his "message":

If we renew the lease of that world we shall betray the heroic dead. We shall be guilty of the basest perfidy that ever blackened a people's fame. Nay, we shall score up retribution for ourselves and for our children. The old world must and will come to an end. No effort can shore it up much longer. If there be any who feel inclined to maintain it, let them beware lest it fall upon them and overwhelm them and their households in ruins.

It should be the sublime duty of all, without thought of partisanship, to help in building up the new world, where labour shall have its just reward and indolence alone shall suffer want.

What a string of delightful empty phrases! How like the man who sold his own party leader for place and pelf, who with a stroke of

the pen undid the life-work of Samuel Plimsoll and sent hundreds of sailormen to the bottom of the sea. This mouther of fine phrases was the man who introduced an old age pensions Bill that was to cut "a path through fields of waving corn" down which the aged poor were to totter to the grave. But the Bill turned out to be a measure to save our masters the expense of keeping our old people in the workhouse. The "benefits" of the Bill may be gathered from the following:

When an aged collier applied at Market Bosworth, Leicester, for an old age pension yesterday he was informed that the law would not allow the Committee to grant him a pension as he had an income of £34 per year. The old man replied that he wished those who made the laws had themselves to live on £34 a year. He had worked in a coal mine for 55 years.

—"Daily News," 4.9.19.

Lloyd George is one of those who have lately engineered the strangle hold on Persia through the new Persian agreement. Curiously enough, this agreement has followed very closely on the acquisition and control of four large Scottish companies by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, and their amalgamation under the title of Scottish Oils, Ltd., with a capital of four million pounds. (See "Daily News," 13.9.19.) The wholesale exploitation of Persian working men is evidently going to find a place in the new world scheme.

This same political twister, who so lately was concerned about small nationalities, was a party to the following transaction:

It was stated by Reuter's correspondent at Brussels that a portion of German E. Africa with a population of 3,000,000 natives has been handed over by this country to Belgium. The transaction is described as a free gift on the part of Great Britain.

—"Daily News," 29.8.16.

Three million natives handed over "free," with the connivance of Lloyd George, to the tender mercies of the crew whose dastardly treatment of the natives in Belgian Congo was so notorious! Where does the "small nationality" rights of the natives come in? Did Lloyd George and Co. consult them as to their wishes?

But to return to "The Future." The last page gives in more detail the new world ideas in an article entitled "The Gospel of Work and Wages," signed "G.W.G.," from which we will take a few extracts:

You want to improve your position. You say that the day of the worker is at hand. It will dawn at once, improvement will come in a flood, when every worker in the land learns and obeys the true gospel of work and wages. Here it is:

GET EVERY PENNY YOU EARN: EARN EVERY PENNY YOU GET.

There are some unwise people who think that when



they pocket wages which they know very well they have not earned they are doing a very clever thing. Nothing of the sort. They are pickling a rod for their own backs.

Look at as a question of morals, that is as a matter of fair-play between man and man. In the bargain with your employer you have exacted from him the last penny in wages. On the other hand, he must exact from you, and you must be willing that he should exact, every stroke of the work for which he is paying.

So this is what Lloyd George means by the phrase "Labour shall have its just reward." For the bare cost of subsistence (our just reward) we must work ourselves stiff the live-long day. Those he refers to as "those who are indolent" are evidently those who do not give the utmost for their wages. The suggestion in the above paragraph that the masters pay us for the work we do is obviously nonsense. They pay us for the time we work (even in the case of pieceworkers), an entirely different thing. The work we turn out in a day far exceeds our wages in value; that is why an idle and parasitic class can live in luxury while we live in poverty.

Let me make another extract:

Never forget that the "boss" takes one very hard job off your shoulders. When work is done, the products which result from it have to be sold to customers, and he finds the customers. If a miner had to sell the coal when he had dug it out of the seam he would be wasting most of his time.

Oh, you wicked, immoral slaves, who would deny your masters their full pound of flesh! Your harassed employers travel around the world in luxurious cars and yachts, basking in Southern suns, romping in Alpine snows, hunting in Indian jungles and African forests. They cloy their sensuous appetites at sumptuous banquets, revive their drooping spirits at grand balls, rejuvenate their interest in life at the races—at least, so it had always appeared to me. But now we know they only do all this to "take one very heavy job off your shoulders," to find the customers for the products of your toil—while hundreds of thousands of your fellows are dying at your doors for want of those very products.

How innocent Lloyd George must think we are when he tries to force such rubbish and humbug into our heads. What finding of customers do the shareholders do who live hundreds of miles from the place where all the work (including the selling) is done?

The working class contains the only people who produce commodities and distribute them to the consumers, and they are the people who, relatively speaking, consume the least. The working class includes all employees, whether they be managers or office boys, scientists or mechanics, travellers or salesmen.

The latest news from America furnishes some suggestive ideas as to the new world of actual fact, as witness the following extracts relating to the strikes against the Steel Trust:

Preliminary disorders disturbed the peace of Sunday in two centres near Pittsburg, where troopers of the State Constabulary broke up meetings that had been prohibited by the local authorities.

Witnesses asserted that a meeting at Clairtown was proceeding in an orderly manner when the police charged the crowd.

Armed guards are protecting the steel mills.

—*"Daily News,"* 23.9.19.

The following from the same paper is an interesting side light on the concentration of capital:

The properties owned by the corporation are valued at £380,000,000 and its total assets at the beginning of the present year were nearly £514,000,000.

And Lloyd George tells us we must work hard or our bosses will go broke!

But enough of this canting hypocrite, whose political life has been the record of delightful promises and shameless betrayals. He is but another of the tools the master class pay to blind the workers as to their true position as wage slaves.

Study Socialism and his frothy phrases will fall on deaf ears. GILMAC.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### CONCERNING RUSSIA AGAIN.

Sir,—My small letter in your May issue about the Russian Constituent Assembly called forth a three-column response from you (which I scarcely expected) touching on various points to which, of course, I am not really called upon to reply. However, in view of their interest, I shall endeavour to make clear my ideas with regard to them, but before doing so I would point out that they are not founded on anything that may have been written in various books published about the Russian Revolution by Litvinov, Phillips Price, Trotsky, Arthur Ransome, etc., for I make a point of not reading them.

At the commencement of your comments on p. 84 you say: "We did not say or imply that the Kerenskyites were in a majority in the Constituent Assembly." In the 3rd paragraph of p. 70 (April) you said "and the Bolsheviks it was who squashed the Kerensky crowd by suppressing the Constitutional Assembly." This surely implies that the Kerensky crowd were in "the majority in the Constituent Assembly," the fact being that, in so far as parliamentary "power" can suppress anything, the Kerenskyites (i.e., the Right Wing Social Revolutionaries, Kadets and others) were suppressed into a negligible

minority by the actual results of the elections to the Constituent, i.e., by the followers of Tchernov's Centre.

As to who were the people that elected the "bourgeois noses" of Tchernov's Centre, this is another point entirely, and I believe has never adequately been dealt with and may perhaps still be a little obscure—I cannot say if it has been dealt with in the books mentioned above. In the first place it should be remembered that the lists of candidates had been prepared under arrangements made largely by Professor Grimm a Kadet (as I pointed out in the "Cambridge Magazine" 26.10.18) during the period of Provisional Governments, and it does not require much imagination to discern that such arrangements under such auspices would scarcely favour really revolutionary candidatures, but would incline to the nomination of "eminently respectable" citizens. I believe the Bolsheviks allowed the elections to the Constituent to be held largely to show how utterly discredited all those elements were that had been ruling the country during the Provisional Government era, and in this they certainly succeeded, for the Kadets and Kerensky, Arksemtier and Co., suffered a debacle unknown even in elections here—a result which could have been more generally anticipated in this country if Kerensky's "oppressive and repressive" activities had been honestly reported by the various newspaper correspondents in Russia. The Kerensky-Kornilov plot "put the lid on," so to speak, and probably very many of the "respectable" candidates arranged for on the lists as partisans of a more or less "Provisional Government" policy swung over from the Right to the Centre of Tchernov.

I must here digress to discuss the class-consciousness of the Russian masses, which the SOCIALIST STANDARD seems to doubt the existence of. If you mean that the vast bulk of the Russian people cannot enter into learned dissertations as to how "Labour determines Price" [which it doesn't. Ed. "S.S."] or how "the magnitude of value expresses a relation of social production," I am with you. But I deny that ability to discuss the Marxian theory is essential to the acquisition of a feeling of "class-consciousness." Owing to the Government opposition to workers organisations for self protection the Russian industrial worker could feel his "oppressed" position better than most as his wages were scandalously low. As regards the peasant-labourer in Russia he saw his landlord, i.e., his immediate oppressor, so-to speak, every day—landlords in Russia lived on their estates much more than is the custom with us (it must not be imagined, however, that all landlords were grasping and cruel). On State-lands and

properties the peasant labourer was treated worse than dirt. Hence all the workers could easily realise as your "first principle" states, that society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living by the master class and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced."

Doubtless very many of the workers voted for "respectable" candidates of Tchernov's Centre, but—with all due deference to the S.P.G.B.'s predilection for parliamentary power—thank goodness the Russian masses had not been educated in a tradition of the "benefits" to be derived from voting somebody into a central assembly sitting hundreds of miles away and vast numbers refrained from doing so on this occasion. Nowhere, not even in Russian papers, have I seen any figures to show that even one-third of the electorate went to the polls for the Constituent Assembly. Millions did not, and these must have included numbers of thoroughly class-conscious workers. The SOCIALIST STANDARD must be aware that many class-conscious workers abstain from elections here; I know many myself.

The Russian masses found it difficult to raise enthusiasm for the Constituent Assembly. As I pointed out in the "Cambridge Magazine" of 26 Oct. 1918, the second All-Russian Peasant Congress, which met some three weeks after the Bolshevik Revolution, passed a vote in favour of the Constituent only by a small majority—360 votes against 321. Another significant fact is that Maria Spiridonova, the "extremist," was elected chairman of this All-Russian Congress. The previous one, held in the Spring, was, if I remember rightly, presided over by Tchernov, and Spiridonova was an upholder of the Soviet idea—as was only natural, she being the great apostle of the communal system of land ownership, also favoured by Lenin, on the lines of the ancient Mir. Of course it is true that hundreds of thousands of peasants have during the Revolution acquired land in direct ownership and thus far cannot be considered as Communists, but in so far as they have abolished landlordism they can be regarded as Socialistic. Lenin being a practical statesman sees the danger of this system, for always present is the menace of usury, under which plot after plot can be acquired by a more "fortunate" peasant and thus peasant-holders may be transferred back to their old position of landless agricultural labourers. Lenin, of course, is fighting this by intense educational propaganda, whilst at the same time encouraging wherever possible the communal land system.

All this, however, does not necessarily imply (Continued on p. 30.)



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

Twelve Months, post free ... 1s. 6d.  
Six ... 9d.

## The Socialist Standard.

WED.,



OCT. 1, 1919.

## THE MASTERS' VICTORY.

Once more the Government, through its control of the trade unions officials, and the ignorance of the rank and file, has scored a victory over a section of the working class in the settlement of the railway strike on Sunday, 5th October. In 1914 the railwaymen were agitating for a raising of their whole standard of life, but the outbreak of war compelled them to postpone their scheme. After the Armistice the agitation began again and included a demand that the war bonuses should be incorporated in the regular wage and an additional sum added thereto.

Last March the officials of the railway unions accepted the Government offer of an "equalisation" or "standardisation" wage with a basis of an average of 100 per cent. on pre-war wages. This was so little to the liking of the men that the officials had great difficulty in keeping them at work, and in South Wales the men came out on strike. That cunning agent of the master class—Mr. J. H. Thomas—was sent down post haste to drive the men back to work, by his influence and his threats, and he succeeded in his mission.

Negotiations on the details of this scheme went on until August, when a settlement was reached in the case of Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners. Mr. Bonar Law had promised that the "equalisation should be upwards," and the railwaymen's officials claimed that the wages of the highest-paid worker in each grade should be taken for the purpose of calculating the "standard" wage of the whole grade. This was done in the case of the Engine-drivers and

Firemen, but all the other grades were reckoned in such a way that every one of them suffered reductions on their present total wage varying from 4s. to 14s. These are the figures given on the Government poster issued on Friday, 3rd October.

Suddenly, while negotiations are still going on, the Government issue the above scheme as a "definitive" or final set of proposals. The constitution of the National Union of Railwaymen gives the Executive Committee full power to call—or close—a national strike without consulting the members. Using this power the Executive called the men out on the 26th September.

There are some curious and even sinister features about this business. If the matter was worth the expense and suffering that a strike entails why was not the strike called when the scheme was first formulated? It is no worse now than then. Again, when it was known that the Government had issued a "final" set of proposals, many people condemned it for its "overbearing" and "autocratic" action. But in the official report of Friday's interview it was stated that Mr. Thomas had asked for final proposals to be sent! Why? Mr. Thomas has not told us, nor is it likely that he will. After allowing the Government six months in which to prepare for such an event the N.U.R. officials take drastic action! Although affiliated to the Miners and Transport Workers in the Triple Alliance Mr. Thomas deprecates any "sympathetic" action being taken by these bodies. Then the Transport Workers officials call a conference at which not only the officials of the affiliated unions attend, like the notorious strike breaker, Mr. J. Sexton, the r-r-revolutionary R. Williams, who fought against the bus conductresses receiving the 5s. war bonus granted to the men, Mr. H. Gosling, the faithful friend of the Government, but also such agents of the employers as Mr. Brownlie of the A.S.E., and Mr. J. O'Grady of the Furniture Trades.

A gathering of this character made assurance doubly sure that the interests of the master class would be strenuously protected, and the settlement reached was merely the expression of their success.

As the master class do not wish to show their own game too clearly a little window dressing had to be done to save the faces of these officials before the men. So while the government scheme so loudly advertised as the cause of the strike is accepted as a whole, its application is deferred till September 1920, and the "standard" wage fixed for the lowest paid section is raised 2s. per week.

And the men gathered at the Albert Hall on the Sunday evening cheered this as a "great

victory." So it was—for the Government. And it will not be the last of their victories. While the working class are willing to put faith and power in "leaders" they will continue to be misled and sold out at critical moments. Giving these men power to settle fights with the masters means giving them something they can sell to these masters whenever the latter wish to bargain.

Not until the workers acquire faith in themselves will they escape from this danger. Once they reach that stage in their mental development and understanding the days of "moderate," "wise," and "statesmanlike" leaders will be gone, and the workers will organise to take control of the means of life by retaining in their own hands the power to decide the issues before them. Then, instead of trying to find out how long they can live on shortened rations, while the masters roll in luxury, they will march to capture the power of control—the political machinery—and end the struggle over wages by abolishing the wages system and establishing Socialism.

## LEWIS HENRY MORGAN. AN ACCOUNT AND APPRECIATION OF HIS LIFE WORK. (Concluded.)

### The Discovery of the Gens.

The second part of "Ancient Society" contains the fruits of those researches of Morgan's which it is generally recognised constitute his greatest contribution to sociology. Prior to its appearance there existed little or no exact knowledge of the tribal organisations of primitive peoples.

In his "League of the Iroquois" and even later works, Morgan himself had adhered to the commonly accepted view that the Mohawks, Senecas, etc., were each nations in many ways equivalent to modern national communities. The smaller groups within these "nations," each of which was called after a certain animal which was its totem, Morgan had designated "tribes." Subsequent investigation, however, convinced him that the larger groups, the Senecas, etc., were the true tribes, and that they were different from the nation which only came into existence after the coalescence of several such tribes, and fundamentally so from the modern territorial nation, in which kinship as a social tie is eliminated.

But the most important fact was that the basic and unitary organisation of the Indians was the smaller group, that which he had earlier called the "tribe." This "clan" or "totem group" he soon recognised, as his researches expanded, to be an all but universal institution

among savage and barbarian peoples. Everywhere it consisted of a group of blood relatives descended, or claiming descent, from a common ancestor. Its members were strictly bound not to intermarry, but to mate outside the group; they elected and deposed their own chiefs, and met together in common council.

Then Morgan made a remarkable discovery. Even the most learned and acute historians up to his time had been greatly puzzled over an institution which existed among the ancient Greeks and was known to the classical Latin writers by the name of "Gens." Being unable to understand its structure or function, Grote and other historians erroneously considered the gens to be an extension and outgrowth of the monogamous family. Morgan, however, showed convincingly in his "Ancient Society" that the Greek and Roman gens is identical in all essentials with the Indian "totem group," the only important difference between them being that among the Indians, except where European influence had crept in, the common ancestor of the group was a woman, female descent prevailed and children always remained in the same totem group as their mother, whereas among the early Greeks and Romans the recognised ancestor was a male, paternal descent was the rule, and children belonged to the gens of their father.

Morgan considered the former an archaic or primitive, and the latter the derived and modified, form of the same organisation, which he decided out of consistency to henceforth refer to by its Latin name of "gens." He believed that the change from the maternal to the paternal gens was an outcome of the growth of private property, possession of which instilled into the fathers a desire that this wealth should be enjoyed, after the death of themselves, by their own children.

Under the law of the gens the property of a member had to remain within the group, and as the maternal system placed a man's children in their mother's gens, never in his own, they were disinherited as regards their father's property. By introducing male descent and thus keeping children in their father's gens they were enabled to inherit his property. Morgan clinched his argument by showing this change to have actually taken place in recent years with the growth of private property among several Indian tribes as a result of foreign influences.

Having thus placed ancient history upon a sound basis Morgan endeavours to show the stages by which, in Greece and in Rome, the social organisation of the gens and the tribe passed away and was supplanted by a form of society based upon possession of property and territorial residence. In a series of brilliant



chapters he shows how increasing population, intermixture of tribes, growing division of social functions, and above all, the increase in private property and its concentration into the hands of a few, all results of the "enlargement of the sources of subsistence," gradually undermined the institutions founded on kinship and prepared the way for and made necessary the rise of the political State.

Morgan's analysis still holds good, but it may be usefully supplemented by Engels' "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," which shows that class-oppression is the function of the State-power. Morgan did not deal with the feudal form of political society which developed from gentile society in a somewhat different fashion, but Engels outlined its beginning among the Germans and it has been adequately if briefly treated in a generalised manner by Edward Jenks in his "Short History of Politics."

One of the most instructive and important chapters in "Ancient Society" treats of the native culture of Mexico prior to the Spanish Conquest. Investigation had convinced Morgan that the records of the Spaniards, together with the historical works which, like Prescott's, were built upon them, were very unreliable wherever they dealt with the social institutions of either the Aztecs or the Incas of Peru. The Spaniards, accustomed only to the social relations of a feudal monarchy, completely misunderstood what little they did observe of Mexican and Peruvian society. They interpreted the league of tribes as an empire and the war-chief of the Aztec federation as an Emperor.

Morgan did valuable pioneer work in unravelling the mystery of "Aztec civilisation," and had already criticised the prevailing misconceptions in some of the articles we have referred to. Moreover, in this field he had the assistance of his friend, Adolph H. Bandelier (1840-1914) a Swiss who had gone to America, and the leading authority at that time on the archeology of Mexico, Arizona, and New Mexico.

In "Ancient Society" Morgan's conclusions were fully stated and the evidence massed which showed that the Aztecs were, at the time of their discovery by Europeans, in the Middle Status of Barbarism, intermediate between the Iroquois and the Greeks of the Homeric period, and that they lived in village communities based upon the gens.

By revealing the inner structure of tribal society Morgan performed a signal service to sociology. Incidentally he showed and was one of the first to appreciate the fact, now generally recognised, that the barbarian is not a blood-thirsty monster of ferocity, and that his society, far from being a despotism ruled over by a

brutal, tyrannical chieftain, is usually a well-organised, democratic body. "All the members of an Iroquois gens were personally free, and they were bound to defend each other's freedom; they were equal in privileges and in personal rights, the sachems and chiefs claiming no superiority; and they were a brotherhood bound together by ties of kin. Liberty, equality, and fraternity, though never formulated, were cardinal principles of the gens." ("Ancient Society, p. 85.)

### The Family and Property.

In the third part of "Ancient Society," which describes the evolution of the family, Morgan not only re-stated his theory (which we have already outlined) in a revised, more complete, and widely generalised form, but he devoted a special section to a refutation of the criticisms of McLennan, the author of "Primitive Marriage." He was now in a position to show that McLennan's position was, in the light of the fresh discoveries, completely untenable, his theory of tribal Endogamy and Exogamy being due to the common confusion of the gens with the tribe.

Morgan's theory of the family is generally accepted to-day in its main outlines. His most important error lay in considering the patriarchal family to be an exceptional form instead of, as has been since shown by the Russian student, Maxim Kovalevsky, and others, to be a widespread institution characteristic of the Middle and Upper stages of Barbarism, and as the intermediary almost everywhere manifest between the matriarchal family and monogamy.

In his concluding part Morgan outlines his view of the development of property. He shows how, feebly developed and largely communal during Savagery, it achieves more definite recognition and power during the pastoral stage in the period of Barbarism and reaches almost complete dominance in social life with the greatly increased productivity of the epoch of Civilisation.

He defines three successive systems of property inheritance, the first two of which correspond with the two stages of female and male descent in the gens among the members of which the property of a deceased member was divided; the third system harmonising with the monogamous family in which the father's property is inherited exclusively by his own family.

Morgan's observations on the social significance of private property are very acute and approximate very closely to the Marxian position. He says: "It is impossible to over-estimate the influence of property in the civilisation of mankind. It was the power that

brought the Aryan and Semitic nations out of barbarism into civilisation. The growth of the idea of property in the human mind commenced in feebleness and ended in becoming its master passion. Governments and laws are instituted with primary reference to its creation, protection, and enjoyment. It introduced human slavery as an instrument in its production; and after the experience of several thousand years, it caused the abolition of slavery upon the discovery that a freeman was a better property-making machine." (Pp. 511-512.)

"The time will come, nevertheless, when human intelligence will rise to the mastery over property. . . . The interests of society are paramount to individual interests, and the two must be brought into just and harmonious relations. A mere property career is not the final destiny of mankind, if progress is to be the law of the future as it has been of the past. The time which has passed away since civilisation began is but a fragment of the past duration of man's existence; and but a fragment of the ages yet to come. The dissolution of society bids fair to become the termination of a career of which property is the end and aim; because such a career contains the elements of self-destruction." (P. 561.)

### Final Work.

With the publication of his principal literary work, the real culmination of his long enquiry into the evolution of human culture, Morgan did not by any means rest from his scientific labours. A true scientist, he continued to investigate and to generalise from the facts so observed, ever searching for fresh truths, ever seeking further to contribute to the totality of human knowledge.

In 1876 he visited the ancient and the modern pueblos, or native villages of Colorado and New Mexico. An early result was his essay on "Communal Living Among the Village Indians."

He devoted his attentions especially to the architecture and domestic life of the Indians, and his final conclusions on this phase of their life were embodied in his last great book, "Houses and House-life of the American Aborigines," which appeared in 1881. This work contains abundant information on the property relations of the Indians and shows in great detail the communistic habits and modes of thought which pervaded their life. Commenting upon the brotherhood and hospitality of the Redskins Morgan says in a striking passage: "If a man entered an Indian house in any of their villages, whether a villager or a stranger, it was the duty of the women therein to set food before him. . . . This characteristic of

barbarous society, wherein food was the principal concern of life, is a remarkable fact. The law of hospitality, as administered by the American aborigines, tended to the final equalisation of subsistence. Hunger and destitution could not exist at one end of an Indian village or in one section of an encampment while plenty prevailed elsewhere in the same village or encampment."

We have now completed our survey of Morgan's scientific and literary achievements. His important and original work earned for him the name of "the father of American Anthropology." In 1873 he had received the degree of Doctor of Laws from Union College, and in 1880 he was President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

At first sight it appears strange that although his vital discoveries were appropriated for their own use by the English anthropologists, to their great discredit they did their utmost to belittle Morgan, and as far as possible ignored, and were silent regarding, his meritorious achievements. No doubt this, in part, was due to the severe blow which Morgan had dealt to the prestige of the English School by causing the collapse of their pet theory—that of McLennan. But, worse still, Morgan had criticised the social power of property, and such criticism could not be tolerated by the intellectuals of the hot-house of industrial capitalism, the birth-place of *Laissez-Faire* "political economy."

Morgan's home was a rendezvous for the leading American scholars and scientists of the day. In his own library Morgan would often gather with a number of young students for the systematic study of ethnology and also of the works of Herbert Spencer, whom he greatly admired.

Morgan took a practical interest in political activity and in 1861 was elected to the N.Y. Assembly, later, in 1868, becoming a Senator. He used all his influence in the endeavour to improve the conditions of life and the treatment meted out to his life-long friends, the Red-men—dying remnants of a splendid race, broken and bespoiled by the fateful finger that writes the story of economic evolution.

Morgan reached through his studies the very verge of the Socialist conception of society. Had his investigations carried him further into the epoch of civilisation he would probably have realised more completely than he did the vast importance of the struggle of classes arising

Of late years there has been a change of attitude, and in addition to the praise of Edward Jenks, we have Dr. Haddon in his "History of Anthropology" referring to Morgan as the greatest sociologist of the nineteenth century.



from those property developments the early stages of which he himself so ably described.

But if his sphere was too narrow to permit of this, it was even less fitted to give Morgan an understanding of the present capitalistic stage of society. It required a man of equal intellect working, observing, analysing, generalising at the very hub-centre of the capitalist world market—London, and this role was played by Marx, in whom Capitalism as well as Socialism found its Morgan.

The works of Marx and Morgan are in a very real sense interrelated and complementary. Together they laid secure foundations for a genuine natural science of social life. This Marx clearly recognised and intended to show in a work upon the evolution of society based upon his own researches and those of Morgan. Unfortunately this, which might possibly have been Marx's master work, was never accomplished—ill health and death intervened. But Marx's great co-worker, Frederick Engels, seeing urgent necessity of such a work, himself undertook the task and produced that classic of Marxian sociology, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," which first appeared in Germany in 1884.

This little book of Engels' was the first real appreciation, outside of America, of the pioneer work done by Morgan. Passing through several editions and translated into numerous languages, it has been the means of spreading a knowledge of Morgan's work amongst members of the working class the world over. To this day, in fact, "Ancient Society" is read and discussed wherever class conscious working-men gather together, while, on the other hand, the average bourgeois student is ignorant, often enough, of Morgan's very name and position in science, let alone being conversant with his writings.

In the estimation of the proletarian student Lewis H. Morgan, by the originality and vast importance of his scientific achievements, occupies a place in that imperishable trinity of nineteenth century science—Marx, Darwin, Morgan.

R. W. HOUSLEY.

#### ITS YOUR MONEY WE WANT.

We are planning the production of a number of publications in the near future, for which it will be necessary to find funds. We trust that friends will rise to the occasion—through the £1,000 fund.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

## GYRATIONS AT GLASGIE.

Glasgow has the largest population of any city in Scotland, so it was decided that the largest representative gathering of Trade Union officials—called the Trades Union Congress—ever held should take place there this year. Delegates more or less (less rather than more) representing five and a half millions of organised workers, gathered in the St. Andrew's Halls to discuss a lengthy agenda.

It was to be a great tournament. A mighty battle was expected to be fought over the Parliamentary Committee's refusal to call a Special Congress at the request of the Triple Alliance. Nationalisation of Mines and other Industries was another great topic. But the supreme struggle was expected to centre around the question of Direct Action. Here the giants would—vocally—spread the ground with each other's gore.

When the Parliamentary Committee's Report was taken Mr. Brownlie, chairman of the A.S.E. and a member of the I.L.P., took the opportunity to repeat to the Congress the clap-trap that the capitalist Press had been so busy spreading since the signing of the Armistice. Following their lead he urged the workers to "increase production" to save the world from ruin. There were five years losses to make up, and we must strain every nerve and muscle to lift production up to, and even above, pre-war level.

We have criticised this absurdity before in the columns of the "S.S.," but the answer will bear repeating. Let us take one or two superficial points first.

If the great need of the moment is "more production," why are not the large numbers of unemployed set to productive work? Neither Mr. Brownlie nor his supporter, the notorious Havelock Wilson, attempted to meet this point when it was put to them. Why, also, are large numbers of productive workers still kept in the Army and Navy long after their promised period of release has passed? Above all, why call upon thousands, many of them highly skilled, that are at work now, to leave that work and join the "Army of To-day?"

The absurdity of the appeal is emphasised by the fact that at the very moment that Mr. Brownlie was speaking wealthy capitalists were shooting grouse over the Grampians, and, in addition to the number of men and women retained to look after their personal needs—cooks, butlers, chaffeurs, grooms, maids, etc.—were employing numbers of men, women, boys, and girls, to act as "beaters" to drive the birds to the butts. In some cases school children were paid 6s. a day for this "productive work."

The essential point, of course, is the fact that the workers have no control or ownership of production. Both the instruments of production and the products are owned by the master class; hence the first result of increased production would be to pile up a large mass of wealth into the possession of the master class. But it should be borne in mind that the bulk of the goods are produced to sell upon the market. The larger the quantity produced in a given time, the sooner will the markets be filled up, with the necessary result that production will be reduced by the masters and unemployment will increase.

Another false statement of Mr. Brownlie's was that we can only increase wages by increasing production. This stupid lie is so easily disproved by the facts that only the extreme gullibility of the workers can explain its currency.

Wages are not determined by the amount of production, as every student of economics knows. A hundred years ago the workers received, on the average, a subsistence wage; to-day, while the production per head has increased in almost every chief industry more than a thousand-fold, the workers' wages still fluctuate about subsistence level. It is the cost of maintaining the worker—and an average family—in working condition that forms the centre point about which wages fluctuate. The variations that occur are due to the struggle between workers and masters over the price to be paid.

It may be mentioned that Mr. Brownlie was not representing the views of the Engineers in the above speech, and he was opposed by another A.S.E. delegate, Mr. Mills.

A resolution to refer back the paragraph in the Parliamentary Committee's Report dealing with the refusal of the Committee to call a Special Congress was moved by Mr. Smillie and supported by R. Williams and others, who introduced a good deal of "Direct Action" argument in their remarks. The strongest speech in support of the Parliamentary Committee was undoubtedly that of Mr. Clynes, despite certain fallacies it contained. His most important point was that the rank and file were not united on the questions that were to be submitted to the Special Congress—abolition of Conscription, withdrawal of troops from Russia, release of Conscientious Objectors, etc.—and this was shown by the rejection of the majority of the Labour Party candidates at the General Election. None of his opponents attempted to meet this point during the debate, nor, on the other hand, were his fallacies exposed.

One was that the trade unions had never used industrial action for political purposes. Yet

Mr. Clynes had himself taken part in such an action when the trade unions agreed to abandon their working rules and conditions to assist in a political purpose—the carrying on of the war. Another fallacy was that "Direct Action" was something new! Any school child could have refuted this. Direct Action is as old as trade unionism. Its first great example—and ghastly failure—was the breaking up of machinery in the Luddite riots. Equally futile was the "rat-tening" of the Sheffield grinders that culminated in the notorious "Broadhead" crimes of the late '60's, while the failure of such action by the munition workers during the war is well known to all. Direct Action has been tried for over a hundred years and proved a rotten reed all the time.

The congress not only passed the resolution referring back, but later on further emphasised their view of the matter by passing resolutions calling for Special Conferences if (1) the Government refused to nationalise the coal mines, and (2) to abolish Conscription and withdraw from Russia.

The utter uselessness of Nationalisation to alter the conditions of wage slavery was shown later on in the same Congress when a long resolution "strongly protesting" against the Government's refusal to administer their own "Fair Wages Resolution" brought forward evidence from Post Office and Admiralty workers' representatives on the poor conditions and low wages prevailing in those departments.

A special resolution on Direct Action was drawn up in the following terms:

"This Congress declares against the principle of industrial action in purely political matters."

The mover—Mr. Shaw—gave a long tirade against Lenin and the Soviet Government in Russia, but said nothing in support of the resolution. Equally beside the point was the seconder's speech. Then Mr. Thomas gave a really brilliant exhibition of tight-rope walking. At one moment Direct Action and Political Action were diametrically opposed; at another moment they were complementary. When the end of a fairly long speech was reached he had so nicely balanced his remarks that no one knew on which side he stood.

Mr. Hodges, the Miners' secretary, tried to combat Mr. Clynes' speech of the Tuesday referred to above, by stating that the present Parliament had been returned by an ignorant working class. He then made the assertion, without the slightest shred of evidence to support it, that they had now arrived at a political consciousness that will cause them to reverse their previous action. He asserted that the Labour Party had done all that was humanly



possible, but their failure to accomplish anything showed the need for industrial action. Suppose the Government decided to embark on another war. Should we refuse to use such power as Direct Action might give? Unfortunately Mr. Hodges quite forgot to explain or show what the "power" was that Direct Action might give while the master class retained control of the political machinery that gave them the domination and direction of the fighting forces.

Then the fight was suddenly side-tracked by the moving of the "Previous Question," which was carried by 2,255,000 votes for to 2 086,000 against. So the great expectations were disappointed in a shuffle.

The most striking incident of the Congress was the presence and speech of Mr. Wadia, President of the Madras Labour Union. In a simple though eloquent address, delivered in excellent English, he described the conditions and wages of various sections of workers in India. About 18 months ago these workers began to form trade unions and to struggle to raise their wages and to improve working conditions. An interesting illustration was given of how the master class use the same tales to deceive the workers in every clime. When the Indian textile workers demanded a rise in wages they were told by the masters that it was impossible to accede to these demands because of the competition of the Lancashire operatives. On arriving in England Mr. Wadia found the English capitalists telling the Lancashire operatives that they could not raise wages because of the competition of the Indian workers!

As showing the awakening of the Indian workers to the necessity of organisation to fight the masters and the understanding of their common interests in these matters with the workers in other lands the visit of the President of the Madras Labour Union was a distinctly hopeful event.

In the course of a discussion on a resolution relating to Ireland a delegate pointed out that the Government had distributed 5,000 armoured cars throughout England last February for the purpose of fighting the miners and railway men. The cars were moved at night and he had met some who had lost their way and obtained this information from them. This fact may assist in explaining the degree of efficiency of the Government's system of road transport in the present railway strike.

Despite the unrest and discontent existing among the working class, the Congress gave little evidence of any great awakening on their part. If some of the patriotic claptrap of Messrs. Wilson and Cathray fell dismally flat, the election of Mr. A. Henderson aroused enthusiasm.

More than ever the need for Socialist education forces itself to the front. The delusion of Direct Action and the snare of "Labour Party" politics have to be strenuously combatted to clear the minds of the workers of such befogging nonsense. Not till these delusions are discarded will the workers unite to fight for the purpose history has placed before them—the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

J. FITZGERALD.

#### CORRESPONDENCE—Continued.

that the majority of the peasants are hostile to the Soviet Government, as is so frequently emphasised by "The New Statesman" and other journals. The bulk of the former landless peasants fully realise that but for the revolutions in the towns there would have been no revolution in the countryside. So many anti-Bolsheviks and others speak of the Bolsheviks as a minority. If they mean that the conscious Bolsheviks as a party form a minority of the people, this is probably true, but it should be remembered that all the voters for a party do not necessarily belong to that or any other party. In Germany, for instance before the war, the Social-Democratic Party obtained over four million votes in the Reichstag; yet the Social Democrats actually numbered only some 900,000 the others were sympathisers with their policy. Such, I believe, is the case in Russia. The Bolsheviks form the largest party, and still have the bulk of the people with them, and as I write this (22.7.19) will soon probably be in possession of large tracts of the magnificent black-earth, dairy-product belt between Tcheliabinsk and Omsk.

Yours, etc., A. P. L.

#### OUR REPLY.

Our critic is rather absurd in his first argument. The history of this discussion is that a correspondent criticised in our April issue our attitude toward the Bolshevik movement. As we clearly stated in May, that correspondent challenged us to explain how it was that (we use his own words) "the workers of Russia overthrew the Czarist and then the Kerensky Government if they were not class-conscious." In our reply we stated that "the Bolsheviks it was who squashed the Kerensky crowd by suppressing the Constitutional Assembly." This our latest critic affects to believe implies that the Kerensky crowd were in the majority in the Assembly. It does nothing of the sort, for both majority and minority were suppressed with the Assembly. We even studiously avoided using "Wage Slave's" term: "Kerensky Government." Not caring to commit ourselves, on the strength of capitalist information, even so far

as that, we spoke only of the "Kerensky crowd." Our statement implied that there was a Kerensky crowd, but not that crowd was a majority.

Our present critic says that he *believes* that the Bolsheviks "allowed the elections to the Constituent to be held largely to show how utterly discredited all those elements were that had been ruling the country during the Provisional Government era." We would like something rather more solid than "A.P.L.'s" "belief" before accepting such a charge against the Bolsheviks. If they had at the time the power to prevent the elections taking place (as our correspondent implies that they had) they surely must have had power to see that those elections took place under such conditions as gave the people the opportunity of voting for Bolshevik nominees. If their idea was to show "how utterly discredited all those elements were that had been ruling the country during the Provisional Government era," that could have been shown just as successfully by a sweeping Bolshevik majority as by a sweeping majority for the "followers of Tchernov's Centre."

All our critic's arguments as to who were the people who elected the "bourgeois noses" of Tchernov's Centre" are beside the point. The question is, were Bolshevik candidates before the public? If they were not why were they not? If they were why were they not returned? Our correspondent says that it does not require much imagination to discern that under the stated conditions the inclination would be to secure the nomination of "eminently respectable" citizens rather than "really revolutionary candidatures." If this were true there is only one explanation of it, and that is that the Bolsheviks were aware, or at all events afraid, that the result of offering Bolshevik candidates throughout the whole field would have been to "show how utterly discredited" the Bolsheviks were, also.

But the whole supposition is silly, as are the arguments which are intended to support it. An electoral victory would have been of immense value to the Bolsheviks, and whatever "A.P.L." may "believe," we give the leaders of that remarkably conducted movement credit for being able to realise the fact.

To return again to the original matter, our critic would appear to claim that the Kerenskyites were suppressed by the balloting for the Constituent Assembly, and therefore not by the Bolsheviks. Even in that case, however (which was a rather different point to that which we understood our first critic to be referring to) our main contention in regard to this point—that the Kerensky crowd was not overthrown by a class-conscious working class—is obviously correct, for class consciousness certainly was

not demonstrated by the workers rejecting capitalist Kerensky and accepting capitalist Tchernov.

Owing to the great length of our correspondent's letter and the number of points he touches on, and also to an unexpected demand upon our space for more urgent matters, we are compelled to hold over a portion of our reply for our next issue.

Ed. Com.

### WHAT THE SOCIALIST PARTY HAS DONE.

"What has the Socialist Party done during the fifteen years of its existence?" This is a query that Socialist lecturers frequently meet with at propaganda meetings. The answer is quite a simple one, in fact, so simple as to appear flippant: "The Socialist Party has remained in existence!" But, as I have said, because of its seeming flippancy, I will go further and explain my meaning.

Fifteen years ago what was the position of the working class? There were strikes, "industrial unrest," unemployment, poverty, and misery, just as there are to-day. The worker was forced upon the labour market to debate the price of his labour power and go to the wall when his usefulness to the capitalist had ceased. This sounds very much as if I am decrying the Socialist Party, as if I am arguing from your side that the Socialist Party has done nothing to justify its existence. You come to that conclusion because you do not know what the Socialist Party is and what it stands for. I cannot blame you for your ignorance. You live in a world of benefit clubs, slate clubs, goose clubs, Liberal, Tory, and Labour parties anti profiteering associations, and others equally ephemeral and useless. It is, therefore, quite apparent that you would imagine we had something to offer. You are used to the election posters: "Vote for Bloggs and cheap workmen's fares," "Vote for Horatio Bunkum, the people's friend," "Hands off the people's beer," and so on. And thus, when at the end of fifteen years the Socialist Party has not manufactured a slogan of that ilk or joined issue with any of the popular reform movements, you naturally *would* think that it had not done much if anything.

Now what are the facts?

The Socialist Party is simply another name for the class-conscious workers organised in one body for the overthrow of the capitalist system and the consequent emancipation of the toilers from the thralldom of wage-slavery. Knowing and understanding that you will realise that until the working class desires its emancipation



the Socialist Party can serve no other purpose than to keep propagating Socialism until the consummation of that desire. Thus it is we work patiently, tolerantly, ever pointing out the right path while the workers chase up and down the side streets of Reform and beat themselves stupid upon the walls of cul-de-sac strikes and direct action. We know, as Marx has pointed out, that the working class will try every road before it finds the right one, and that eventually we shall be rewarded for our long and arduous fight.

For fifteen years strike after strike has occupied the industrial arena, reform after reform has been enacted on the political field, and still the proletariat is the slave class in society. But we see that on all hands more and more attention is being given to the doctrine we teach and the philosophy we expound. At every propaganda meeting held now thoughtful interest and a desire to understand is manifested, while intending members come forward in larger numbers than before. And we tell the working class, as we told them fifteen years ago when first we challenged capitalism, that only in our ranks will they achieve their victory.

Thus when pseudo-Socialist organisations waver and fall, when politicians have so turned the workers from this stunt to that that they do not know where they stand and are an easy prey to the political harpies who batten upon their ignorance, we can repeat: "We have remained in existence!" Our clarion call has not wavered one semi-tone. We challenge all traducers; we flaunt our principles pennon-wise, stainless and unrent, and call to the struggling proletariat to come with us out of the blood and tears and agony of Capitalism into the joyous, sun-litten new world of Socialism.

S. H. S.

#### S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR OCTOBER.

LONDON DISTRICT.

##### Sundays:

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.  
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.  
Finsbury Park, 6 p.m.  
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.  
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.  
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7.30 p.m.

##### Mondays:

Tollington Rd., Holloway Rd. (near Nag's Head), 8.

##### Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

##### Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

##### Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

##### Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156, High St.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 183. Vol. 16.]

LONDON, NOV., 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

## WAGES AND PRICES.

THE SOCIALIST VIEW.

Ever since the armistice gave the signal for the reopening of industrial warfare we have been met on all hands with the cry "High wages mean high prices."

**The Tale they Tell Us.** Editors and politicians have tried to outdo one another in the attempt to convince the workers that they have reached the limit

in "bettering" their financial position. To listen to their arguments one would imagine that profits had ceased to exist, that wages were the only charge on industry, and that the capitalist employers' only aim in life was to find work for the workless.

The facts—that prices soared mountains high before wages commenced to move, that wages have not generally managed to catch up with prices, and that an *excess* profits tax has been good business for the State—are carefully kept in the background. The workers fail to make both ends meet and are told that they themselves are responsible for the failure.

We are further warned of the loss of foreign trade, just as though no other country had labour troubles, and as though the workers were responsible for the war which gave America and Japan their opportunity for filching Europe's markets. But the best joke of the lot is the way in which our teachers deplore the workers' ignorance of economics! Every fragment of the truth which the

**Put Them to the Test.** latter get into their heads is ferociously assaulted as a fallacy. Let the workers, however, do a little *more* thinking and then

see what becomes of newspaper economics.

The first thing that strikes one about the wages question is that if the employers can so easily pass on any rise to the consumer in the form of an increased price why their strenuous opposition to these rises? The obvious answer

is that the thing cannot be done; that if it is possible to raise prices in a given state of the market the capitalist takes advantage of the fact quite independently of any advance in wages. On the other hand, no rise in wages can enable a seller of commodities to get higher prices out of an unfavourable market. He has to put up with less profits! There's the rub! And since profits, like wages, have to come out of prices, we might as well argue that high profits are the cause of high prices.

As a matter of fact, however, neither wages nor profits nor both together form the basis of prices. Prices express value, a state of equality between two commodities; thus £2 = 1 pair of boots or two chairs, etc. Before we can understand value or prices, wages or profits, we have to know in what sense money is equal to the things it buys, and further, in what sense these things, being equal to money, are, therefore, equal to one another.

What is value?—that is the question which knocks the stuffing out of any newspaper economist who has the pluck to tackle it—and there are not many that have, despite their desire to teach others.

If we take a sovereign and any commodity it will buy (say a looking glass) and compare the

**Your Eye Skinned.** two we are at first baffled to find any similarity between them. Size, shape, smell, colour, taste, weight—in every physical or chemical quality they differ. Yet men

will exchange the one for the other. Their equality, therefore, must have something to do with their relationship to mankind. It is, in other words, a *social* relationship. Something that human society does with money and mirrors gives them value *before* the exchange



takes place. What does society do? It produces them! All commodities are the products of social labour. It is the act of labouring which puts value into them, and the quantity of labour, measured by the necessary time it takes, is the substance of value and the basis of prices.

The enormous increase in prices since the commencement of the war is therefore due in the main to the upheaval in the conditions of production. Millions of producers cannot, it is obvious, be pitch-forked into the arena of destruction without upsetting the established ease and rapidity with which wealth is produced.

To the workers, at any rate, it should be clear that their demands for higher wages are based upon this same preceding rise in prices, and that unless these demands are conceded it will be impossible for them to retain their efficiency as producers. That is to say that, unless the price of their commodity keeps pace with the prices of other commodities, of which it is a product, there will be less of that commodity available.

At the same time they must further realise that on the average nothing more than the value of their commodity can be obtained. The capitalists can and will successfully resist any encroachments upon their profits. Wage-saving machinery on the one hand, and the unemployed on the other, exist to keep in check any efforts after a wage which represents more than the cost of producing labour-power.

Is the position of the workers without remedy, then? By no means. Let us invert the logic of our masters. If high wages mean high prices, then no wages should mean no prices. In other words, if the workers agreed to work for nothing they should be able to receive the fruits of their labour for nothing likewise. Our newspaper editors have probably never thought of this outcome of their reasoning. If the workers took them and their ideas in deadly earnest a curious situation would arise. Who or what would decide which belonged to the workers and which to the capitalists? Only the naked force of the State! The truth would then be revealed that the capitalists are robbers, that the wages system is a blind, and that might is right. The workers might then listen to the Socialist Party, and, spurred on by the knowledge they would thus acquire, commence to organise in real earnest for Socialism.

E. B.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.  
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

### "IF ONLY—!"

That organ of capitalist interests, "The Star," in a recent editorial (14.10.19) sheds its rays on some of the bestial products of our vaunted civilisation. It shows some of the streams from the overflowing cesspool of capitalism, but, being what it is, it takes care not to reveal the source—the actual cesspool!

The most characteristic feature of capitalistic journalism, it seems, is its supremely cunning evasion of basic truths. All kinds of fine phrases, lies, half-truths, pathos, and camouflage are good material wherewith to erect buttresses to prop up a decrepit, damned, and doomed system of society.

The "Star" heads its editorial "If Only—." It pronounces its benedictions on the League of Nations Union and refers to it as "the greatest hope of mankind." It says: "The King's message pleases us. He says that 'millions of British men and women, poignantly conscious of all the ruin and suffering caused by the brutal havoc of war, stand ready to help if only they be shown the way.'" (Italics mine.)

The "Star" takes its cue from the King's Message. It deplores the bitter results of the war with as much fervour as it aided and abetted its prosecution when the "Honour and Liberty" of capitalist thieves was at stake.

Speaking of war it says: "We all hate it. We all passionately desire to make it impossible in our time or in our children's time. Why, then, is the universal will of mankind defied or evaded?" And it querulously asks: "Why can't we get on with the building of the League of Nations?"

It proceeds: "Mr. Asquith in his lucid and laconic speech says that all is not going well with the League. Old and new wars are being waged. Men are being slaughtered. Wealth is being wasted. From Riga to Fiume there are baleful omens. A pallid impotence paralyses statesmen. A year has slipped away since the Armistice, and with every month the chance of wiping out war is ebbing. Mr. Asquith tells the doomed world that if the nations for another generation go on cherishing animosities, hatching rival ambitions, manoeuvring by some new system of groups and alliances for international positions, and in the meantime husbanding their resources for that purpose, there is an end—a tragic and decisive end—to all the best hopes of humanity. War as we have endured it is horrible, but war in the future will be immeasurably more horrible."

Ay! Millions of men and women were deluded by the capitalist battle-cry of "A War to End War." Millions of workers doubtless cherished hopes that the Great War would mark

the beginning of a warless future when it was brought to a "glorious conclusion." But it has not.

Their hopes have been torn from them and trampled on in this "period of reconstruction." The "beautiful new world" spoken of by that arch-deceiver of the working class, Mr. Lloyd George, is as sordid and hellish a world as ever the old one was.

Having successfully essayed the inequitable task of starving the German people into supine surrender and smashing them militarily, the Allies are now engaged in the biggest political crime against a whole race ever engineered. Russia, with its teeming millions of inhabitants, is being slowly but surely starved to death by a blockade of the most infamous character, in order to make it safe for—CAPITALISM!

All and every naval and military means in conjunction are being employed in a sanguinary struggle ostensibly to crush out Bolshevism—a purely working-class movement. Seemingly no sacrifice of workers' has been too great to seat Capitalism firmly in the Russian saddle and possibly to re-establish Czardom. The present writer, remembers having seen the cover of a magazine on which appeared in glaring letters, "Russia—England's opportunity." Exploiters, thieves, and all the plutocratic scoundrels of the world have feasted their greedy eyes in imagination on the vast virgin wealth of the Russia they desire to exploit.

"The chance of wiping out war is ebbing," wails the "Star." And if that paper spoke the truth that it knows so well it would admit that there never has been a "chance of wiping out war." Under capitalism war is a "cert." Sooner or later, whenever capitalist interests in conflict cannot be adjusted in the political field, they are fought out on the battlefield by masses of the working class pitted against each other in groups by their callous masters, and compelled to commit wholesale fratricide for the sake of financial interests and sordid commerce.

The capitalist spokesman, Asquith, in his "lucid and laconic speech," practically admits the menace of a great eruption of the war volcano in the not distant future. None knows better than he that it is capitalism alone that caused the Great War, and that will again set the war machines in motion whenever and wherever is pursued a relentless search for markets and control of trade routes.

None knows better than he that a league of nations is no preventative of future wars. Under capitalism war is the final method of settling the claims of opposing interests: "Victory" its arbitrament—for which the workers pay in agony and death.

The social atmosphere is electrical with discontent, suspicion, and mistrust: the deluded people are beginning to see the inability of their rulers and exploiters to make of Earth anything other than Inferno. The failure of the present system is apparent. Its inevitable turmoil is shaking the whole structure of society; its bankruptcy is palpable. Even in "peace" time its civilisation is a piggery gaudily painted to camouflage its essential slime and filth.

To continue the quotations from the "Star":

Mr. Asquith says that the world is still bristling with the machinery of destruction. The mills of murder are still working full time. The war budgets of all the Powers are still on an appalling scale. We are worse than the worst. We set the pace for our allies. It is a hot and hellish pace. Why are we wasting hundreds of millions on armaments that cannot possibly be used if we mean what we say? Is it to fill the pockets of the armaments firms? Is it to support parasites in khaki? Is it to supply an instrument for insensate ambition? Or is it sheer pure stupidity?

Is not this an admission of the inability of our masters to create a "beautiful new world"? And what of this?—

The chemists are only lisping the "alphabet of destruction." In a few years they may invent horrors, that will torture and slay us in our beds, not by tens but by hundreds of thousands.

We all know this. We all foresee the inevitable agony that is being prepared. And yet we are helpless. We cannot coerce the fools or chain the lunatics. We are the victims of a nameless evil. . . . We lack the courage to impose our will upon the pygmies who mismanage our affairs. The bitter truth is that the people in every land are giants who are caught in the toils of cunning and crafty miscreants who are coldly cruel in their selfishness, pitiless in their arrogance, merciless in their vanity.

The bemoaning fatalism evinced in the above reflects the fact that the capitalist class are unable to check the mighty forces they make use of. The proletariat the world over are learning by bitter experience that Capitalism alone is their enemy, and that if the world is to be free they themselves must set it free. The anarchy and chaos caused by the present system is such that we are rapidly approaching the time when it will become unworkable. Crisis will follow crisis, and the world's wage slaves will have the truth of their position forced upon them as their misery increases.

Workers, for your own sakes and for humanity's sake study Socialism! Then, when you understand it, you will organise to establish it and so emancipate yourselves from the shackles of wage-slavery on the one hand, and rid yourselves for ever from that awful and doubtless true menace of war which butcher Asquith, for sordid ends of his own, so vividly depicts but can find no reasonable remedy for.

GRAHAM MAY.



## LIFE UNDER SOCIALISM.

Before Marx and Engels placed Socialism on a scientific basis those who believed that capitalism was only a passing phase in the history of the human race often endeavoured to sketch plans for a future State. To-day we know that all such plans were utopian dreams. We know it because the progress that has been made in the means and methods of production has left those plans—based on the then existing means—far behind. We know, too, that any such pictures of the future we might sketch to-day, if based on our present methods of production, would be idle dreams, because all the time we are hovering on the brink of new discoveries that, at any moment, may fundamentally change our method of living. Beyond the elementary facts that we, as human beings, shall continue to need food, clothing, and shelter, and shall be obliged to obtain them by some labour process, the future is unknown, and all efforts to lift the veil, or plan details of the future, are waste of time and energy.

The Socialist does not pretend to foretell the future. All that he claims is that he understands the present, with its class ownership of the means of life and the consequent enslavement of his class. The defenders and agents of the ruling class deny this enslavement and claim that Socialism would result in loss of liberty to the individual. It is evident, however, that class ownership and control implies a class that is subjugated and therefore without liberty.

Socialism, on the other hand, being a system of society where the means of life are owned in common and democratically controlled, must give the maximum freedom to the individual because there is equality of ownership and control.

Under capitalism the worker is subjected to restrictions and rules, and subjugated to a discipline which would be hard to beat. It is only the master class that possesses liberty, and their liberty means working class slavery.

The Materialist Conception of History, discovered by Marx, Engels, and Morgan, besides assisting to place Socialism on a scientific basis and explaining past history, also explains the present and makes it clear to us why we cannot foretell the future. The intellectual life and institutions of society are the result of—and can only be explained by—the means and methods of producing and distributing wealth. As we cannot foretell the future development of the means of life, the institutions, intellectual life, and general conditions must remain hidden.

Of what does the intellectual life of society consist? After the commercial and technical sides (which are obviously determined in their nature by the means and methods of produc-

tion) comes politics. Analyse politics and we find, first, international relations, treaties, diplomacy, and all the quarrels and agreements between the ruling class of different nations. This is the territorial side and divides the working class by boundaries for the purpose of arranging exploitation. Secondly, the legal changes and social reforms made necessary by the continual changes in the means and methods of production and distribution. The poverty of the working class increases because the social system is out of harmony with the means and methods of production; and this causes numerous disputes between capitalists and workers. The settlement or prevention of these disputes is a constant theme for discussion in Parliament and in the Press. Every debate in the House of Commons is, in one form or another, the outcome of social conditions in process of change. Social relationships, the relations between man and man, or between class and class, do not stand still; and the cause of their change is the evolution of the material things—tools, machinery, etc.—on which man depends for his subsistence.

The political history of the past has been a succession of struggles 'twixt subject and ruling classes for the control of power. With the necessary physical force on its side to dominate society, each class has in its turn secured its position as far as possible, and settled down to enjoy the fruits of its victory. No previous class in history, rising to power, has ever doubted its ability to use it—why should the working class?

The forerunners of the modern capitalist class in the sixteenth century were themselves a subject class. They threw off the yoke of the lords and monarchy, and commenced their rule with no settled policy beyond the determination to be masters of society. Their policy has never been any different down to the present day. The executive government deals with every situation as it arises. They cannot tell what problems will call for settlement in a year's time. Not knowing what the conditions will be, the problems that result from them cannot be known, consequently every act of government can only be an expedient to prevent friction, to avert a crisis, or to restore a balance that has been upset by changes in the means of producing wealth, and so preserve the even continuity of capitalist rule.

In short, history and experience tell us that it is impossible to foretell the future. Why should we try to do so? What we are concerned with is the present—how to make the best of life now. How do the ruling class achieve that? By using the power conceded to them by the bulk of society, the working class. While the workers are asking questions about

the details of a system which they can only arrange in accordance with the stage of development reached by the means of production, they are neglecting to understand and grasp their opportunities to-day. Is it not sufficient for the workers that they should be free from the domination of the capitalist class, and, controlling their own destinies, shape their lives in accordance with their knowledge of nature? What have they to fear when free? What must they suffer when not free?

But "who is to do the dirty work?" a capitalist agent asks. And the half-starved wage-slave who has never done anything else all his life says "Ah! that's it, who indeed?" The absurdity of all such questions is apparent when we remember that man in the most critical period of his life's history, in the morning of time, when beset with enemies and dangers on every hand, treasured his freedom above everything else, and associating with his fellows on a basis of equality, controlled his social actions democratically.

Man's confidence in, and adherence to, these two principles, carried him safely through the age of savagery. His abandonment of these principles was the beginning of the long class rule, in which successive ruling classes have robbed the workers of the results of their toil.

Society has passed through the different stages from savagery to civilisation and machine industry. In the process those who have produced the world's wealth have submitted to various forms of slavery, each more oppressive than the preceding. From chattel slavery—its crudest form—to wage slavery—where the slave condition is veiled by the so-called freedom of contract. At first the incongruities of class ownership of the means of life and the commodity character of human labour-power are not recognised by either class. But as the system develops and poverty and squalor on the one hand, and enormous wealth and power on the other, become more pronounced, men seek to know the cause; and finding it in the fundamental principles that constitute the basis of the social system, they seek, according to their class, either to abolish the system or discredit the truths discovered.

Actuated by self-interest the ruling class hurries on the development the consummation of which threatens their extinction, while at the same time they do their utmost to retard any conscious action on the part of the working class to place society in harmony with the means and methods of production. Their first line of action drives the workers into worse poverty, while their second is aimed to prevent them seeing the cause of, or the remedy for, their poverty. Thus the task of harmonising the

social system with the more highly developed means of production is wholly that of the working class, and must be carried through against the conscious antagonism of the master class.

To overcome this antagonism appears, at first sight, a stupendous task, but the means for its achievement are within reach. The knowledge is available and scientifically arranged. Communication is easy. The workers have the bulk of the votes and can acquire political power when they are ready. All that is wanted is for men and women to attain the knowledge, rouse their fellows from their apathy, and pass on the knowledge to them. Socialism can be established as soon as there is a majority of Socialists. The first step, therefore, is to make Socialists. With a clear majority Socialists can secure a majority in the executive councils, and through them control the armed forces. The possibility of the master class using these against the workers is thereby removed, and the workers can proceed at once to the second step—the restoration to the people of the land and all the means of production and distribution. The next step will be the organisation of production in such a manner that the workers have complete control—not a share in management, such as labour leaders plead for.

First must come ownership: until that is effected the workers can have no control, either over the means or methods of production, or over their own conditions of employment.

There is no question of morality or justice about this expropriation of the capitalist class. The wonder is that the workers have tolerated the system so long. A small class in society owns all those things required by man to produce for himself the necessities of life. This small class imposes slavery on those who do not own. To free themselves from slavery must be the desire and the aim of the working class. But they must have confidence, based on knowledge, in their associated power to arrange the details of production and distribution for use. On such a basis they can tread the future without fear, because science has destroyed the superstitious terrors of the dark ages and given us a clearer understanding of the laws of nature. The days of oracles are past; the workers to-day, producing all wealth, understand all the secrets of production. It is they who discover all improvements in means and methods. Without a ruling class they can still carry on, producing wealth for their own use and consumption. Let them, first, understand; second, take possession, and exercising full control, face the future determined to use nature's gifts for the well-being and happiness of society free, at last, from the withering blight of class rule.

F. F.



## BY THE WAY.

One has grown accustomed of late to hear it asserted in various quarters that the working class has entered upon an era of untold "prosperity." This being so I am at a loss to understand why it is that throughout the length and breadth of the land vast numbers of little children labour long hours for very little monetary reward. To me this seems to suggest the opposite of "prosperity." Why do parents of working-class children send their offspring of tender years out to toil? Though Cabinet Ministers repeatedly tell us that the panacea for all our ills is increased production, we never read of their children or grandchildren, as the case may be, going in early years (or any other) to labour in mill, mine, or factory, or to deliver the morning milk or papers. Why, then, is this phenomenon reserved for the workers' children? It therefore appears that the poverty position of the parents forces them to send out their young in order to swell the family exchequer. With the ever-increasing cost of living the struggle to make ends meet becomes ever more keen.

While not desiring to overburden the reader with tedious statistics, I cannot refrain from reproducing some interesting details on the question of employment of school children. Here they are:

The Medical Sub-Committee of the Warrington Education Committee has published some striking figures as to child labour in that town. Several hundreds of children under eleven years are employed out of school hours. One girl of seven works 7½ hours weekly, another works 21 hours for 6d., and a girl of nine is employed 14 hours for the same wage.

A boy of eight years works 2½ hours every day and 8 hours on Saturday for 2s.; another, aged nine, works 28 hours a week in a bakehouse. A lad of ten works 25 hours a week, of which 13 are on a Saturday. A girl, aged ten, washes, peels and chips potatoes for 20 hours a week for the sum of 1s. Not one of the 721 cases investigated got proper remuneration with the exception of the boys who sell and deliver newspapers.

Sir George Newman gives the following instances in his report to the Board of Education:

Errand boy, aged twelve, works an hour before breakfast, 1 hour at mid-day, 4 hours after school, and 13 hours on Saturday. His wages are 1s. 9d. a week, and his teacher reports him inattentive in school, overtired and nervous.

Boy of eleven worked 2½ hours before school, 2½ after school, and 13 hours on Saturday. Teacher reports he often fell asleep at school.

Boy of eleven works in and about stables for 8 hours a day, and 14 hours on Saturdays. Wages 6d. a week and his food. Teacher reports that he is dull and languid in school.

Then Mr. Spurley Hey, Director of Education in Manchester, says that—

in that city there are 6,000 children of school age employed for profit, some of whom work for 40 hours a week in addition to their time in school.

The last quotation which I shall give is by no means the least. It states—

In Birmingham there are 9,000 school children similarly employed, several hundreds of whom work over 40 hours a week, and one poor little child who works over 70 hours a week.—Quotations from the "Daily Chronicle," October 7th, 1919.

Thus in Christian England nineteen centuries after Christ is supposed to have said "Suffer little children to come unto me," we find those who "call upon His name" re-echoing his words in their endeavour to obtain cheap labour and enhanced profits. Well may our contemporary refer to it as a "Child Labour Scandal."

More prosperity! "The Barking Education Authorities are to spend £50 on providing boots and shoes for necessitous children," runs an announcement in the "Daily Herald" (15.10.19). This step is being taken, so we are informed, owing to the number of cases in which want of boots is given as an excuse for non-attendance at school.

Strong comment was made at the London Sessions by the Deputy-Chairman on the niggardliness of "our grateful country" to its heroes when a case was before them of an ex-soldier charged with shop-breaking. Here is what the Deputy-Chairman said:

I understand you have been so severely wounded that you are incapable of doing any work, and a grateful country gives you 11s. a week to live upon. In those circumstances I do not know what on earth you could do except commit crime for a living. I shall take all steps in my power to see that this matter gets attention. It is perfectly scandalous, and the prisons of this country will be filled if that sort of pittance is given to people rendered incapable of doing any work.—"Reynolds's," October 26th, 1919.

In that entertaining column, "The Office Window," which graces the pages of the "Daily Chronicle," there recently appeared a jingle of rhyme which, like the straw, shows how the wind blows. The writer of the verses ("Sleet in Picadilly") inquiring why the vagaries of the weather, concludes that it is because—

Jove has been dealing in sealskins and muffs.

God as a profiteer! That any writer in one of the great English dailies should dare suggest such a thing is pretty significant of the trend of current ideas.

THE SCOUT.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

CONCERNING RUSSIA AGAIN.

OUR REPLY—Continued.

When our correspondent "digresses," to use his own term, "to discuss the class-consciousness of the Russian masses," he does not really digress at all, but gets back to the point at issue. "I deny that ability to discuss the Marxian theory is essential to a feeling of 'class-consciousness,'" says "A.P.L." That one sentence makes clear the different standpoints from which we are respectively arguing. To the Socialist class-consciousness is not a "feeling" but a knowing. A hatred of the master class does not of itself make a class-conscious proletarian. To be such one must know more than that one is oppressed. To say that: "Owing to the Government opposition to workers' organisations for self-protection the Russian industrial worker could feel his 'oppressed' position better than most as his wages were scandalously low," is fatuous, since other races of workers have passed through the same stage of "oppression" and scandalous wages without exhibiting any clear knowledge of their class position and the course of action dictated by that position.

If class-consciousness were no more than a "feeling," no more than a realisation by the workers that there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark" because they were oppressed and their wages were scandalously low, then indeed would class-consciousness be of so little use to the workers as to be unworthy of serious thought.

As to how far a proletarian must be able to "discuss the Marxian theory" before he can properly be termed class-conscious is quite beside the point. The minimum that is essential to class-consciousness is that it shall be useful in the struggle of the working class for their emancipation. It must, therefore, not only comprise a knowledge of the existence of classes in society—that is not very helpful. It must comprise a knowledge of the "Marxian theory" of the class struggle (i.e., that all written history is a history of class struggles), as only that knowledge can raise the worker's strivings to the class struggle basis, and prevent him being trapped into fatal alliances with his inveterate and historic enemies, the master class.

Class-consciousness must also include a knowledge of that other "Marxian theory," the Materialist Conception of History, which shows that the roots of social change lie in the development of the means and methods by which mankind gain their livelihood, and indicates that the whole social structure rests upon its

economic foundation. This knowledge teaches that the basis of the social system is the private ownership of the means of living, that wage slavery must necessarily ( chattel slavery being out of the question) be the life condition of those who produce the wealth, because while a section of the community own all the means of living, those who do not own must sell to the others their labour-power for wages.

This theory leads logically, also, to the conclusion that, since the social system rests upon its economic foundation (which is the private ownership of the land, factories, machinery and other means of living), and since this in turn in the long run depends upon the development of the instruments of production, the present social base must, given the continued development of those instruments (which nobody doubts), give place sooner or later to another, with the result that the whole social system must undergo a change.

It is needless to go further. Let us compare the actions of A.P.L.'s Russian "peasant-labourer," whose "class-consciousness" rests on the fact that he "saw his landlord, i.e. his immediate oppressor, every day," with the actions of the truly class-conscious worker.

The latter, from the study which has brought him to the acceptance of the Materialist Concept, realises that the only property condition in harmony with that stage of development of the means of production wherein those means can only be operated by social labour is social ownership, proceeds to institute social ownership. The Russian "peasant-labourer," on the other hand, "A.P.L." tells us, elected "Maria Spirodonova, the 'extremist,' chairman of this All-Russian Congress, . . . as was only natural, she being the great apostle of the communal system of land ownership, also favoured by Lenin, on the lines of the ancient Mir."

Of course this is "only natural." The Russian "peasant-labourer" understands nothing of Marxian theories, so he is anxious to get back to the "good old days" of the Mir—under which the land was not the property of the whole of society, but only of the Mir group.

But "A.P.L." may be assured that as surely as "direct ownership" may, as he says, transfer the peasant back to his old position of landless agricultural labourer, so will the return of the land to the Mir carry him back to the semi-barbarism of that ancient system.—Ed. Com.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.



## OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " " " "	9d.

## The Socialist Standard,



SAT.,

NOV. 1, 1919.

## COAL AND CANT.

On the 9th October the Prime Minister met a deputation representing the Trades Unions Congress and the Miners' Federation, who presented a demand for the nationalisation of the coal mines on the lines laid down by the Sankey Report. Mr. Stuart Bunning, representing the T.U.C., said the demand was made not on the views of the miners alone, but of the large number of organised workers affiliated to the T.U.C. The fact that the representatives of 5½ millions of workers should fancy that the nostrum of Nationalisation would be of use or benefit to their class is good reason for examining the proposition in detail.

According to the report of the interview given in the "Daily News" (11.10.19) Mr. Smillie, representing the miners, put forward two main reasons why the mines should be nationalised. The first was that "the mines are largely unsafe because they are working for private profit." In what way Nationalisation would make them safer we are left to guess. There is no evidence that the railways have become safer for the railway workers since they have been under government control, nor has it ever been put forward that the Admiralty Dockyards are safer than private ones. Until evidence of this character is forthcoming the hope that the mines would be safer if nationalised remains purely a hope. The Government's treatment of its broken tools—the disabled soldiers and sailors—shows how much the "hope" is worth.

Mr. Smillie's second point is given as follows:

I want the mines nationalised in order that by the

fullest possible development on intelligent lines, with the assistance of the engineering power we know we possess, we might hereby develop the mines and increase the output and so reduce the price of coal.

Coming at this moment, after a certain bitter experience by the miners, the last suggestion in this statement is simply staggering. Coal is under government control now, and a few months ago, without any economic reason, the price was raised by 6s. a ton. Despite this swindle, perpetrated on his own members so recently, Mr. Smillie still calls for increased production. Yet increase of output by itself does not mean a reduction in price, and, as the above example showed, it may be accompanied by a rise in price. For the purpose of playing political tricks and misleading the workers the Government would be quite prepared to repeat and extend these swindles. An illustration from a branch of industry that is practically a trust will show the absurdity of this claim that increased output necessarily means reduced prices. The capitalists in this industry are urging the worker to "produce more," and the surplus above the requirements of the home market is exported. But note the situation. Prices are kept up or even raised at home while the exported articles are sold below cost—or to use a well known phrase, are "dumped"—to beat the foreigner in his own market. (See Report of Committee on Trusts.)

Neither is it certain that Nationalisation would result in "the fullest possible development of the industry." While this is possible it is far from probable, as experience of the Government departments during the war—and since—have shown only too well. Corruption and incompetence have been rampant in these departments, and there is no reason to suppose there would be any improvement in the case of coal.

But these points are not the important ones. The ignorance of the organised workers and lack of knowledge—or lack of honesty—of their leaders is shown in this demand made upon a capitalist government to nationalise an industry. It should be clear to any worker that the control of an industry by such a Government means that the business will be run on capitalist lines—that is on profit-making lines. Though it may not be run for individual profit, it will be run for the collective profit of the capitalist class. Nationalised industries are expected to show as good a result as—or a better than—the private business, as, for instance, in the case of the Admiralty Dockyards. As a consequence of this fact the workers in Government departments are so badly paid as to have to struggle as hard to lift up their wages, or to improve their conditions, as the workers employed by private capitalists. The Post Office and

Government dockyards are good examples of this truth. But there is one important difference. When an industry is nationalised there is only one employer—the Government. If for any reason a worker is discharged from such an industry he is compelled to seek a living in another calling, as there is no one else in his old business to give him a job. In this respect the worker is worse off under Nationalisation than under private employment.

The fundamental fallacy underlying the T.U.C. and Miners' demands for Nationalisation of Coal Mines—and it applies with equal force to the nationalisation of any other industry—is their failure to recognise the slave character and position of the workers. Denied all access to the means of production, except by the permission of the master class, the workers are unable to produce the necessities of life for themselves. As their means of life are controlled by the master class, it necessarily follows that their life itself is under the same control. When one's life is under the control of another person, one is a slave to this person. The working class are therefore SLAVES to the master class.

This great fundamental fact remains whether the masters split up the control of the means of production among the individuals or groups of their class, or whether they decide to collectively control them, or any part of them, through their executive committee called the Government.

The workers will remain wage slaves while capitalism lasts, even though every industry were nationalised.

Not until the working class grasp this simple fact will they organise correctly for the overthrow of capitalism and the real control by the workers of their means of life. Nationalisation is one of the red-herrings the agents of the master class are always ready to trail across the path to divert the workers from the course their interests demands that they should follow. Its failure to fulfil expectations will help to disillusion many of those workers who are urging it forward now. When the workers realise this they will begin to examine and study the right course to follow—which is to fight for Socialism.

## A SERIES OF

## 3 MEETINGS

WILL BE HELD IN THE

TOWN HALL, STRATFORD

ON

DECEMBER 7th, 14th and 21st.

Doors open 7.

Chair taken at 7.30

## "TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD."

FROM A CORRESPONDENT IN AMERICA.

Under the above title John Reed has written his experience in Russia during the Bolshevik rise to power in November, 1917. It is to be followed by another called "From Kornilov to Brest-Litovsk," covering a later period.

We are flooded with books on the Russian uprising, but still lack a story of the events in Russia written by a Socialist. In other words, we have no book written with an understanding of the relation of actions and movements in Russia to the principles and policy of Socialism.

Apart from a number of war correspondents' pictures of the rise of Kerensky, we have several so-called radical works on the subject. John Reed's wife, a Suffragette (Louise Bryant), went to Russia for a capitalist Press syndicate and wrote a series of articles which appeared in all the leading newspapers of America. These are now reprinted under the title of "Six Red Months in Russia." It is a typical journalistic effort, being some descriptive sketches of people she met and things she encountered. There is no appreciation of the economic or historical value of the actions she describes, and her fulsome praise of Bolshevism is based upon enthusiasm unlit by understanding. Although the lady knows nothing of Socialism she is routed all over the States at high fees and worshipped by every Bolshevik.

Bessie Beatty, of the "San Francisco Bulletin," a capitalist daily, also took a journalist's trip into Russia. She wrote a series of articles for the magazines now published as "The Red Heart of Russia." Like Louise Bryant she was toured all through the country by the Socialist Party and others. Her book adds little to our knowledge, giving the usual story of the *coup d'etat* of Bolshevism and the break-up of the Constituent Assembly. There is no examination of the strength of Bolshevism compared with other parties, no enquiry into the truth of so-called reasons for abolishing the Constituent Assembly and the volte-face of Lenin and Trotsky on this subject, and we miss any study of the state of Socialist knowledge in Russia in the alleged Bolshevik book.

Now we come to the present book. John Reed is best known as a war correspondent and the author of a book on the Eastern Front. He has been connected with "The Masses" and "The Liberator"—Max Eastman's weeklies.

John Reed voted for President Wilson in 1916 and his articles betrayed no Socialist knowledge. Since his return from "Bolshevik Russia," however, he has been connected with the



left wing of the Socialist Party, but his work for Socialism is nil. Like his fellow war correspondent, Arthur Rhys Williams, he capitalised his Bolshevism by speaking everywhere to enormous crowds at enormous fees.

His book purports to be a detailed account of the November Revolution. In a fragmentary fashion he tells the story of the starvation and chaos of the armies at the front and the delegations of soldiers coming to Petrograd in October 1917 demanding something to be done for them. Kerensky's Government were demanding that Russia should stick to the Allies, but internal disorder was drawing the Provisional Government to its fall. Peasants, tired of waiting for the promised land, were burning manor houses and massacring landholders. Korniloff's advance on Petrograd and his capture by loyal forces cemented the union for the time being against counter revolution. Kaledine's Don Cossacks were plotting against the capital, and on October 23rd a naval battle took place with a German squadron in the Gulf of Riga.

On the pretence that the capital was in danger plans were drawn up to evacuate Petrograd.

The Bolsheviks saw in this move a plan to kill rising by removing the Government from the Red centre.

The Bolsheviks called a National Congress of Soviets for November 2nd. This was opposed by the supporters of the Government as being too near the date for the convening of a Constituent Assembly. In the midst of chaotic local election conditions the delegates came to the National Soviets. Judging from the inevitably unsettled conditions it is difficult to know who they represented and what support they had. But this was the Soviet Congress which captured the Government for Bolshevism.

Before the Congress met, Reed tells us, the Bolsheviks in Petrograd were considering an insurrection. Lenin and Trotsky alone favoured it, but their scheme was defeated. Then a "rough workman" and a few soldiers appealed for insurrection and Lenin and Trotsky won. In such a sentimental fashion were the Bolshevik Executive Committee swayed to change their attitude in a few minutes.

The right wing of the Bolsheviks continued to campaign against an armed rising. These were led by Kameniev and Zinoviev. The success of Bolshevik propaganda drove the Kerensky Government to formulate laws for giving the land temporarily to the peasants and for pushing a foreign policy of peace.

In the meantime the question of withdrawing the "Red" troops from Petrograd and sending them to the front had caused the Petrograd soldiers' soviet to appoint a military revolutionary committee, and this acted as the instru-

ment of insurrection and organised the coup which took control of the Government.

On the fateful day—November 7—the Ministry of War and other Government offices were sieged by the soldiers and many Ministers were arrested. Kerensky escaped.

The All-Russian Congress of Soviets at Petrograd on November 7th, 1917, controlled by Lenin and Trotsky, issued an appeal to the working people of Russia claiming that it would "ensure the convocation of the Constituent Assembly at the proper date."

The first decree read by Lenin was one on land ownership transferring it to the township land committees and district soviets to be dealt with "until the Constituent Assembly meets."

"The peasant delegates wild with joy" is Reed's description of the result of the enactment of the decree.

A further decree was on the Constitution of Power:

*Until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, a provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government is formed, which shall be named the Council of People's Commissars.*

Within a few days Moscow Red Guards took charge of the Kremlin and controlled the city for the Bolsheviks. The battle between the Committee of Public Safety and the soldiers under the military revolutionary committee lasted six days. In a scrappy fashion Reed tells the story of the control of the cities by the Bolshevik faction, and it reads more like a conspiracy than a proletarian revolution.

On the night of November 17th, 1917, opposition to Lenin's policy grew.

"Larin (Bolshevik) declared that the moment of elections to the Constituent Assembly approached, and it was time to do away with 'political terrorism.'"

"The measures taken against the freedom of the Press should be modified. They had their reason during the struggle, but now they had no further excuse. The Press should be free, except for appeals to riot and insurrection." (Page 267.)

Contradictory statements in opposition to this were made by Trotsky and Lenin. On the one hand they said "The victory over our enemies is not yet achieved, and the newspapers are arms in their hands" (p. 269), and they further said that the bourgeois parties "are in the minority." But how can we explain Lenin's statement (p. 271) that "the immense majority of the people is with us" if they were forced to close down all opposition papers to prevent the workers being influenced.

The vast majority claimed by the Bolsheviks

must have been very wavering to be influenced by the anti-Government Press.

Five members of the Council of People's Commissars resigned declaring:

We are in favour of a Socialist Government composed of all the parties in the Soviets. We consider that only the creation of such a Government can possibly guarantee the results of the heroic struggle of the working class and the revolutionary army. Outside of that, there remains only one way: the constitution of a purely Bolshevik Government by means of political terrorism. This last is the road taken by the Council of People's Commissars. We cannot and will not follow it. We see that this leads directly to the elimination from political life of many proletarian organisations, to the establishment of an irresponsible regime, and to the destruction of the revolution and the country. We cannot take the responsibility for such a policy, and we renounce before the Tsay-ee-kah (Central Executive Committee of National Congress of Soviets) our function of People's Commissars.

Five others signed without resigning. At the same time Kameniev, Rykov, Miliutin, Zinoviev and Nogin resigned from the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party making public their reasons:

The constitution of such a Government (composed of all the parties of the Soviets) is indispensable to prevent a new flow of blood, the coming famine, the destruction of the revolution by the Kaledinists, to assure the convocation of the Constituent Assembly at the proper time, and to apply effectively the programme adopted by the Congress of Soviets.

We cannot accept the responsibility for the disastrous policy of the Central Committee, carried on against the will of an enormous majority of the proletariat and the soldiers, who are eager to see the rapid end of the bloodshed between the different political parties of the democracy. . . . We renounce our title as members of the Central Committee, in order to be able to say openly our opinion to the masses of workers and soldiers. . . . We leave the Central Committee at the moment of victory; we cannot calmly look on while the policy of the chiefs of the Central Committee leads towards the loss of the fruits of victory and the crushing of the proletariat. . . .

The old officials continued to sabotage the Government and strikes of technical functionaries took place, especially in halting the transportation of food. Banks, railroads, posts and telegraphs were jeopardised by this walk out. The armies at the front were dying of hunger.

The Peasant's Congress on November 27th was a stormy affair ending in the Bolsheviks adopting the land platform of their opponents, the Social Revolutionaries. At the outset of the Convention, Kolchinsky, for the left Social Revolutionaries pointed out (p. 302)

the Council of People's Commissars abolished private property in land, but the regulations drawn up by the Land Committee are based on private property. . . . However, no harm has been done by that.

for the Land Committee are paying no attention to the Soviet decrees, but are putting into operation their own practical decisions—decisions based on the will of the vast majority of the peasants. . . .

Reed promises to tell us in his coming book why the Constituent Assembly was destroyed by the Bolsheviks. In the meantime it may be well to note that in his "Letter to the Comrades" (326) written a few days before the insurrection of November 7th 1917, Lenin says:

Since September the Bolshevik party has been discussing the question of insurrection. Refusing to rise means to trust our hopes in the faith of the Bourgeoisie, who have "promised" to call the Constituent Assembly. When the Soviets have all power, the calling of the Constituent is guaranteed, and its success assured.

E. S.

### THE LORD DIDN'T PROVIDE.

The Press has been shedding the usual crocodile tears over a rather interesting case of poverty. The vicar of Hubberholme, Buckden, has, it seems, been suffering the evils of the vile system which he supports, in consequence of which he finds himself in the hands of the Official Receiver.

Debtor had been having what many a man of greater use to his fellows has had—a rough time. His missus has had to do what millions of equally good mothers have had to do—turn out and work in order to help to feed and educate her kids. The Socialist may not deny her a little sympathy. It is not her fault if there is a flaw in the old tag—"The Lord will provide."

But the unfortunate Holy Joe found a pal in the Official Receiver. "I stand beside this debtor," this officer said ("Daily Chronicle," 11.6.1919), "who has been faced with the alternative of the starvation of his wife and his children or of resorting to moneylenders. If the Church and other denominations don't see that their clergy are better paid, if Christianity does not compel them to do it then humanity ought, and we should not have people of education faced with such a horrible alternative."

Ah! There you see the source of the Official Receiver's emotion. Parson is a man of "education"—and the O.R. is another. For such people financial embarrassment should never, of course, exist. The little ironies and jokes of this mad system should not pucker the "educated" brow. Starvation really should, you know, be reserved for those who have not sufficient education to enable them to get into the moneylenders' ribs to the tune of several hundred pounds.

And somehow or other, it usually is.

JACKO.



## A RETROSPECT.

## LESSONS DRAWN FROM THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT FROM 1848 TO 1895.

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

[The reprint given below of the last of the published writings of Frederick Engels is of especial value to-day in its application to the conditions prevailing in Europe. If events have so strongly falsified his views as to the strength and soundness of the rank and file of the German Social-Democratic Party, it should be remembered that when that organisation was formed by the fusion of the two previously existing parties—the Lassalleans and the Marxists—both Marx and Engels opposed the fusion, and only accepted the situation some time after, when the steady growth of the party seemed to justify its formation. The war has shown completely that the original views of Marx and Engels were right, while those of Bebel, Liebknecht, and the others were wrong, though many Marxian students proclaimed the unsoundness of the German party long before the war. In other words, the principles which Marx and Engels did so much to establish have proved to be correct even in the case where Engels was persuaded that a modification was required. A firm grip of those principles is the only safe guide for the workers to-day.—Ed. Com.]

As the February revolution of 1848 broke out we were all, as regards our views of the conditions and course of revolutionary movements, under the influence of previous historical experience, especially that of France. It was just this latter which had controlled all European history since 1689, and from which once more the signal for a general upheaval had gone out. Hence it was natural and inevitable that our ideas of the nature and course of the "social" revolution proclaimed at Paris in February, 1848, the revolution of the proletariat, were strongly coloured by recollections of the prototypes of 1789 to 1830. And particularly as the Paris revolt found its echo in the victorious uprisings at Vienna, Milan, Berlin; as all Europe up to the Russian border was swept into the movement; as then in June at Paris the first great battle for supremacy was fought between proletariat and bourgeoisie; as even the victory of their own class so convulsed the bourgeoisie of all countries that they flew back again into the arms of the monarchic-feudal reactionists whom they had just overthrown: under all these circumstances there could be no doubt in our minds that the great

decisive conflict had begun, and that it would have to be fought out in a single long revolutionary period with varying success, but that it could only end in the final victory of the proletariat.

After the defeats of 1849 we did not by any means share in the illusions of the pseudo-democracy which was grouped around the outskirts of the provisional governments. This was counting on an early, once for all, decisive victory of the "people" over the "oppressors"; we were counting on a long struggle after the removal of the oppressors, a struggle between the antagonistic elements hidden in this very "people" itself. The pseudo-democracy was expecting from day to day a renewed outbreak; we declared as early as in autumn 1850 that at least the first chapter of the revolutionary period was closed, and that nothing more was to be expected until the outbreak of a new economic world crisis. And for this very reason, too, we were excommunicated as traitors to the revolution by the very same people who afterwards almost without exception made their peace with Bismarck—so far as Bismarck found them worth having.

But history has shown that we, too, were wrong, and has exposed our opinion at that time as an illusion; it has done more: it has not only demolished our error, it has totally recast the conditions under which the proletariat has to fight. The 1848 method of warfare is to-day antiquated in every particular, and that is a point which at this opportunity deserves to be closely examined.

All previous revolutions resulted in the displacement of one class government by another. All previous ruling classes were, however, only small minorities compared with the subject mass of the common people. A ruling minority was overthrown, in its stead another minority seized the helm of state, and remodelled the political institutions according to its own interests. In every case this new minority group was one which the progress of economic development had trained for and called to rulership, and for that very reason and only for that reason it happened that at the time of the revolution the subject majority either took sides with it or at any rate acquiesced in it. But ignoring the concrete details of each particular case, the common form of all these revolutions was this, that they were minority revolutions. Even when the majority assisted it was, consciously or unconsciously, only working in the interest of a minority. This fact, or even the passive non-resistance of the majority, gave to the minority the appearance of being the representative of the whole people.

After the first great victory the successful

minority as a rule became divided; half was satisfied with what was already won, the other half wished to go farther yet and made new demands, which at least in part were in the real or apparent interest of the great mass of the people. These more radical demands were in particular instances carried through, but for the most part only temporarily: the more moderate party again got the upper hand, the latest gains were wholly or partly lost again. The radicals then raised the cry of "treason," or attributed their defeat to accident. In fact, however, matters stood about so:—the results of the first victory were made secure only by another victory over the more radical party. This done, and thereby the immediate demands of the moderates being attained, the radicals and their following disappeared again from the stage.

All the revolutions of modern times, beginning with the great English revolution of the seventeenth century, showed these features, which seemed inseparable from every revolutionary struggle. They appeared to be also applicable to the struggles of the proletariat for its emancipation; all the more applicable as in 1848 the few people could be counted who understood even in a general way the direction in which this emancipation was to be sought. The proletarian masses themselves even in Paris after the victory were still absolutely in the dark as to the course to pursue. And yet the movement was there, instinctive, spontaneous, irrepressible. Was not that exactly the condition in which a revolution was bound to succeed, though led, it is true, by a minority, but this time not in the interest of a minority, but in the truest interest of the majority? If in all the more prolonged revolutionary periods the great masses of the people had been so easily won over by the merely plausible inducements of ambitious minorities, how could they be less accessible to ideas which were the purest reflex of their economic situation, which were nothing else but the clear, intelligent expression of their own wants, wants as yet not understood by themselves and only indistinctly felt? It is true this revolutionary temper of the masses had nearly always, and generally very soon, given way to lassitude or even to a reaction into the opposite attitude, as soon as the illusion had vanished and undeception had taken place.

Here, however, it was not a question of promoting the most vital interests of the great majority itself—interests which, it is true, at that time were by no means clearly seen by that great majority, but which in the course of practical enforcement were bound soon enough to become clear to it by the convincing force of experience. And now when in the spring of

1850 the development of the bourgeois republic which arose out of the "social revolution" of 1848 had concentrated all actual power in the hands of the great bourgeoisie, and this having monarchical inclinations, too; and when on the other hand this same development had grouped all other classes of society, both peasants and small-bourgeoisie, around the proletariat in such a way that in and after the joint victory the controlling factor would be, not those others, but the proletariat itself, grown sharp-witted through experience—was there not every prospect at hand for turning a minority revolution into a majority revolution?

History has shown that we, and all who thought like us, were wrong. It has made it plain that the condition of economic development on the Continent at that time was not yet ripe enough by far for the abolition of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which since 1848 has transformed the whole Continent and has for the first time effectively naturalised large-scale industry in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and, more recently, in Russia, while out of Germany it has actually made an industrial State of the first rank—all on a capitalist basis, which system therefore in 1848 was still capable of great expansion. Moreover, it is just this industrial revolution which first brought about clearness everywhere in class relations; which shoved aside a lot of middle men who had come down from the early manufacturing period and in Eastern Europe even from the guild system; which created a genuine bourgeoisie and a genuine factory proletariat and pushed them to the front place in the social development. Thereby, however, the struggle of these two great classes, a struggle which in 1848 existed outside of England only in Paris, and at most in some few great industrial centres, has spread for the first time over all Europe and reached an intensity which in 1848 was inconceivable. Then there were many confused sectarian gospels with their different panaceas; to-day the single, transparently clear and universally recognised theory of Marx, which sharply formulates the ultimate aims of the struggle; then, massed, separated, and differentiated by locality and nationality, bound together only by a feeling of common suffering, undeveloped, tossed helplessly back and forth between enthusiasm and despair; to-day one great international army of Socialists, unceasingly advancing, daily growing in numbers, organisation, discipline, intelligence and certainty of victory. If even this mighty army of the proletariat has not yet attained its object, if far from wresting victory at one grand stroke, it has to press slowly forward from one position to another in a hard, tenacious struggle, this



proves once for all how impossible it was in 1848 to effect the transformation of society by a mere sudden onslaught.

A bourgeoisie, split into two dynastic monarchical factions, but which demanded before everything else peace and security for its financial transactions; confronting it a proletariat, conquered but still threatening, and around which the small tradesmen and peasants were grouping themselves more and more; the constant threatening of a violent outbreak, which after all offered no prospect of a final solution—that was the situation, fitted as if made to order, for the forcible usurpation of the pseudo-democratic pretender, Louis Bonaparte, yclept the Third. On December 2, 1851, with the aid of the army, he put an end to the strained situation, and secured internal peace for Europe in order to beautify it with new wars. The period of revolutions from the bottom up was for the time being closed; there followed a period of revolution from the top down.

The set back of 1851 towards Imperialism gave new proof of the unripeness of the proletarian aspirations of that time. But it was itself destined to create the conditions under which they must ripen. Internal peace secured the full development of the new industrial life; the necessity of keeping the army busy and of turning the revolutionary activities away from home engendered wars in which Bonaparte, under the pretense of giving effect to the "nationality principle," sought to rake up annexations to France. His imitator, Bismarck, adopted the same policy for Prussia; he played his political grab-game, his revolution from the top, in 1866 against the German confederation and Austria, and not less against the recalcitrant Chamber of Deputies in Prussia. But Europe was too small for two Bonapartes, and so the irony of history would have it that Bismarck should overthrow Bonaparte and that King William should restore not only the small German empire, but also the French Republic. The general result, however, was this, that in Europe the autonomy and inner unity of the large nations, with the exception of Poland, had become a reality; true, it was only within relatively modest limits, but yet far enough so that the developing process of the working class was no longer materially hindered by national complications. The gravediggers of the revolution of 1848 had become executors of its will; and beside them arose the proletariat, the heir of 1848, already threatening, in the new International.

After the war of 1870-1871, Bonaparte disappears from the stage and Bismarck's mission is completed, so that he can now subside again to the level of an ordinary country squire. But the

closing act of this period is formed by the Paris Commune. A treacherous attempt by Thiers to steal the cannons of the Paris National Guard called forth a successful revolt. It was again demonstrated that in Paris no other revolution is possible any more, except a proletarian one. After the victory the leadership fell uncontested into the lap of the working class, just as a matter of course. And again it was shown how impossible it was even then, twenty years after the former effort, for the leadership of the working class to be successful. On one hand France left Paris in the lurch and stood by looking on while it was bleeding under the bullets of McMahon; on the other hand the Commune wasted its strength in a barren quarrel of the two disagreeing factions, the Blanquists, who formed the majority, and the Proudhonists, who formed the minority, neither of which knew what to do. The victory of 1871, which came as a gift, proved just as barren as the forcible overthrow of 1848.

With the fall of the Paris Commune it was thought that the militant proletariat was everlastingly buried past resurrection. But quite to the contrary, its most vigorous growth dates from the Commune and the Franco-Prussian war. The complete transformation of the whole military system by bringing the entire able-bodied population into the armies, now running into millions, and by the introduction of firearms, cannon and explosives of hitherto unheard-of power, put a sudden end to the Napoleonic war era, and assured a peaceful industrial development by making impossible any war other than a world-war of unprecedented gruesomeness and of absolutely incalculable consequences. On the other hand, the increase of the army budget in a geometrical progression forced the taxes up to an uncollectable point, and thereby drove the poorer classes into the hands of Socialism. The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, which was the immediate cause of the mad competition in preparations for war, might goad the French and German bourgeoisie into chauvinism towards each other, but for the workingmen of both countries it was only a new bond of unity. And the anniversary of the Paris Commune became the first general holiday of the entire proletariat.

The war of 1870-1871 and the overthrow of the Commune had, as Marx foretold, shifted the centre of gravity of the European labour movement from France to Germany. In France it took, of course, years to recover from the blood-letting of May, 1871. In Germany, on the contrary, where industry was developing faster and faster, forced on in hothouse fashion by the providential milliards from France, the social democracy was growing faster and yet more

enduring. Thanks to the intelligence with which the German workingmen made use of the universal suffrage, introduced in 1866, the astounding growth of the party is revealed to all in incontestable figures. In 1871, 102,000 social democratic votes; in 1874, 352,000; in 1877, 493,000. Then came the high official recognition of the gains in the shape of the anti-Socialist law. The party was for a moment demoralised; the number of votes in 1881 fell to 312,000. But the relapse was soon overcome, and then under the pressure of the anti-Socialist law, and without a Press, without a recognised organisation, without the right of association or of assembly, the growth began to increase more rapidly than ever. In 1884, 550,000; in 1887, 763,000; in 1890, 1,427,000. Then the hand of the State was palsied. Then anti-Socialist law disappeared; the number of Socialist votes rose to 1,787,000, over a quarter of the total votes cast. The Government and the ruling classes had exhausted all their expedients; they were useless, aimless, resultless. The tangible proofs of their impotence which the authorities, from the night watchman to the imperial chancellor, got shoved under their noses, and that, too, from the despised workingmen, were numbered by millions. The State had got to the end of its Latin, the workingmen were only at the beginning of theirs.

Moreover, in addition to this, the German workingmen had done their cause a second great service, besides the first one, consisting merely in their existence as the strongest, best disciplined, and most rapidly growing Socialist party; they had shown their comrades of all countries a new weapon, and one of the keenest, in showing them how to use the ballot.

Universal suffrage had long existed in France, but had come into disrepute through the misuse which the Napoleonic government had made of it. After the Commune there was no labour party in existence to make use of it. In Spain, too, it had existed since the republic, but in Spain it was always the custom of all the real opposition parties to refrain from voting. And in Switzerland, too, the experiences with universal suffrage were anything but encouraging for a labour party. The revolutionary workingmen of the Romance countries had become accustomed to look upon the ballot as a snare, as an instrument of oppression manipulated by the government.

In Germany it was different. The Communist Manifesto had already proclaimed the winning of universal suffrage, of democracy, as one of the first and most important tasks of the militant proletariat, and Lassalle had taken up the point again. And when Bismarck saw that he was forced to introduce this franchise as the

only means of getting the masses interested in his plans, our workingmen at once took the matter seriously and sent August Bebel into the constitutional convention. And from that day on they have used the ballot in a manner that has repaid them a thousand fold and has served as an example to the workingmen of all countries. They have transformed the ballot, in the words of the French Marxians, "de moyen de duperie, qu'il a été jusqu'ici, en instrument d'émancipation"; from a means of jugglery, which it has been heretofore, into an instrument of emancipation. And if universal suffrage had offered no other advantage than to allow us to count ourselves every three years, and by a regularly certified and unexpectedly rapid increase of votes to raise in equal degree the confidence of the workers and the terror of their opponents, and thus to become our best means of propaganda; and to inform us exactly as to our own strength and as to that of all opposing parties, and thereby give us a standard for apportioning our activity such as could not be equalled; and to save us both from untimely hesitation and untimely rashness: if that were the only benefit derived from the franchise, even then it would be enough and more than enough. But it has done far more. It gave us in election campaigns an unequalled opportunity to come in contact with the masses where they still stood aloof from us, and to force all parties to defend their views and actions before all the people against our attacks; and it also opened to our representatives in Parliament, a forum from which they could talk to their opponents in Parliament as well as to the masses outside, with an entirely different tone of authority and freedom from what they could use in the press and in meetings. What good did the anti-Socialist law do the government and the bourgeoisie so long as the election campaigns and the Socialist speeches in Parliament were continually nullifying it?

(To be Concluded.)

"Housewives all over the country will learn with interest," says the "Daily Chronicle" (7.11.1919) "that Messrs. J. and P. Coats, the huge Paisley cotton and thread manufacturers, yesterday disclosed the fact that in their last year's trading they made a profit of close upon four millions sterling! This profit was made after paying excess profits duty, which probably runs into hundreds of thousands of pounds."

And now does anybody doubt that higher wages means a 7½d. reel of cotton?

Do not overlook the important announcement on page 41. All should support who can.



## OUR £1,000 FUND.

The burning desire for Socialism is reflected below. It is two months since we published our last list, and in that time nearly £7 has been subscribed to our Thousand Year—pardon, Thousand Pound Fund. Five guineas of that sum, be it observed, are from branches, leaving something less than £2 from individuals—£1 a month (nearly); 5 bob a week (nearly). In two months eight (8) individuals have "cast their bread upon the waters"—what a shock this must be to our trembling masters!

Now we are not going to beat about the bush. We have a desire. We have an ambition. We will out with it, yea, swelpuschrist we will.

And this is what we have set our heart upon—that the revolutionary proletarians of this country seal their faith in sacrifice. It can be done. How about a Self Denial Week? How about sending a Tank round? How about a Victory Loan and Premium Bonds?

Well, we will not be put off. Whatever the means you have got to raise that fund to—5 bob a week clear of branch donations.

## TWELFTH LIST.

Already acknowledged	-	-	£425	3	11½
Tottenham Branch	-	-	2	0	0
Walthamstow "	-	-	1	5	0
Islington "	-	-	1	0	0
Tooting "	-	-	1	0	0
H. Baker	-	-	10	0	
J. Mills, (Canada)	-	-	5	0	
A. J. Stuart	-	-	5	0	
A. T. Samuels	-	-	4	6	
M.A.B. (Fulham)	-	-	2	6	
Green V. Page	-	-	2	6	
"Howe"	-	-	2	6	
C.W.C. (Clydebank)	-	-	2	0	

Total £432 2 11½

## S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR OCTOBER.

## LONDON DISTRICT.

## Sundays:

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.  
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.  
Finsbury Park, 6 p.m.  
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.  
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.  
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7.30 p.m.

## Mondays:

Tollington Rd., Holloway Rd. (near Nag's Head), 8.

## Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

## Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

## Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

## Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 155, High St.

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

## OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

## HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.



# THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 184 Vol. 16.]

LONDON, DEC., 1919.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

## CLYNES IN THE RING.

HE DEFENDS SWEATING.

In the October number of the "S.S." appeared an article which contained the following:

**What** Prices are high, they tell you, because  
**We** there is a real shortage of wealth—of the  
**Said.** necessities of life. If this is true why are  
there unemployed? Because your masters  
are not concerned with increasing the total  
quantity of wealth; their desire is for more  
surplus value, i.e., the difference between the wealth  
you produce and the wages you receive. All the wealth  
you produce belongs to your masters. Your wages  
are paid out of that wealth, and are determined by  
what it costs you to live. What they ask from you is  
more work from the individual worker, in order that  
the total wages bill can be reduced, the very condi-  
tions that have always made for increased unemploy-  
ment. All the lying agents of the master class are  
denying this truth day after day, hoping, by constant  
repetition, to make you believe what they have not  
yet advanced a scrap of evidence to support, or a single  
reason on which to base their denial.

In a subsequent article mention was made of  
the eagerness with which labour leaders had  
rushed to the assistance of the master class in  
their efforts to intensify exploitation. Now we  
find one of these labour leaders so zealous in  
the defence of capitalist interests, so eager to  
persuade the workers to give more energy for  
less wages, that he reveals himself as an oppo-  
nent of Socialism by openly attacking the So-  
cialist truths quoted above, but, like all the  
other agents, without a scrap of evidence,  
reason, or argument to support his case.

Mr. J. R. Clynes heads his article ("Reynolds's Newspaper," Nov. 30): "Who Would  
Gain Most From Increased Out-  
put?" At the foot of our article  
**That** which he attempts to criticise  
**Awkward**  
**Question.** appears the following:

The productiveness of labour has  
increased a thousandfold in the last 500 years, yet  
those who labour are in constant penury and want.  
Why is it?

When Mr. Clynes can answer that question he  
will have answered his own.

His attempts to show that the workers need  
more boots, clothing, houses, etc.,  
**The** and they will get them by increas-  
**Real** ing output, were all beside the  
**Point.** point. The questions that concern  
the worker are, how much wages?  
how many hours of labour? how fast or how  
heavy is the labour? Meeting the capitalist on  
the labour market, the worker endeavours to  
sell his only commodity, labour-power, to the  
best advantage. The shortage of houses, boots  
or clothing has nothing to do with the bargain  
each side is driving. If it had, then the capi-  
talists in times of "over-production" should  
have preached the opposite doctrine—but did  
they? Let Mr. Clynes ask the building trades  
workers how they fared during the seven years  
before the war, when there were thousands of  
empty houses and small demand for their labour-  
power. Or let him ask the boot and shoe opera-  
tives who were kept on in the factories while  
their unemployed comrades tramped to London  
to demand work, if these unemployed were not  
used as a lever to extract more surplus value  
from those at work.

It is needless to cite further examples. Mr.  
Clynes knows quite well that  
**"He Knows"** capitalists demand—and obtain  
**About** —the maximum quantity of  
**It All."** energy for the lowest wage they  
can get the workers to accept, and  
that they do this whether there is a shortage or  
a glut. In the latter case they are more easily  
successful, that is the only difference.

But even when there is scarcity the capitalists  
do not suffer from it. "Their exceptional  
purchasing power comes to the rescue." Mr.  
Clynes says so. It is only the workers who  
suffer, and, what is more, their suffering is



greater when there is plenty than when there is scarcity.

In his attempt to answer his own question, who would benefit most by increased output, Mr. Clynes says "greater production can be brought about without any benefit to the master class." He does not say how; nor does he attempt to show that statisticians like Sir Leo Chiozza Money are wrong when they assert that two-thirds of the wealth produced is taken by the employing class. The power of the capitalist class is due to their possession of the means of wealth production and control of the political machine. Their ever-increasing share of the wealth produced is due to the development of the means and methods of production and the greater efficiency of the workers. Mr. Clynes' assertion that greater production can be brought about without any benefit to the master class is, therefore, an empty assertion. Production does not go on at all unless the employing class can see markets for the commodities. Mr. Clynes might do worse than search for a cause of the housing shortage along these lines. If wages are too low to allow of the payment of an economic rent, capitalists—in spite of the "human nature" and "real regrets" with which he credits them—will certainly refuse to risk their capital.

Greater production without benefit to the capitalists can only be attained when there are no capitalists, and when production is carried on for use instead of for profits. This solution, however, is ruled out by Mr. Clynes, who says that "all Socialists should have the sense to agree that pending the Socialist State we must make the most of what we have got." What have we got? Poverty, toil that grows more strenuous daily, and long periods of unemployment while factories and stores are packed with goods we cannot use because they belong to our masters. Apart from these the Socialists have got the knowledge that poverty is due to the capitalist system and will end with its abolition and the establishment of Socialism. Mr. Clynes objects to this knowledge becoming the common possession of the workers. Why? Because his particular job, making excuses for the failure of capitalism, will be ended.

Like all the labour leaders who have thought it worth while to publish their antagonism to Socialism, Mr. Clynes only raises issues that are irrelevant or not essential, or dodges the real issues at stake with sentimental clap-trap. Not once does he attempt to answer the main question in the article he pretends to criticise. If there is a real shortage of necessities and the capitalists want an increase in the total wealth, why are there unemployed? But this is not the only point on which he is silent. He uses four

quotations from the article in question without acknowledging their source. Bearing in mind his silence on the previous question, one can only conclude that he feared some of his readers might read the article for themselves.

But all the advocates of increased production are up against the question of increasing unemployment. They have to explain away an accumulating mass of evidence proving that many thousands of workers have been unemployed for months. The official statement is "over 400,000 men and women on the unemployment list. Meanwhile the "Daily News," Dec. 2nd, reported that "at a meeting of ex-service men at Shepherd's Bush yesterday Mr. G. Banks said there were in that district over 14,000 unemployed ex-service men, and in another column of the same issue, that "The National Union of Dock Workers in Liverpool now requires every new member to pay an entrance fee of £5.

"It is stated that the supply of labour at the docks considerably exceeds the demand, and this fee has been made in order to check the influx. The dockers have decided not to work with non-unionists."

Mr. Clynes dodges the bugbear of unemployment in the following manner:

Nor is there any sense in failing to distinguish between the functions of a State and the position and duties of individual employers of labour. It is true that the State since the end of the war has dismissed many workpeople, and has failed in its duty in not preparing to turn these workers from war pursuits to creative and useful services in some sphere of peacetime production.

Having been a member of a capitalist government Mr. Clynes should know its functions and its relations with the "individual employers of labour." As an executive of the employing class the governments' chief function is to facilitate and regulate the exploitation of the working class. The Government makes provision for the safeguarding of the capitalist State against enemies internal and external. It provides for the education of the workers according to capitalist requirements. It collects taxes from the capitalists for these and other purposes, all directed to the same object—the maintenance of the conditions that permit exploitation of the workers. Anything that hinders the process of exploitation is bad for the capitalist and becomes the subject of State interference. Hence the unemployed dole to civilians was stopped to force them into more strenuous competition on the labour market, and to economise in the interest of the taxpayer, or capitalist. At present the capitalist State is largely concerned with legislation and measures for preventing the workers from striking, at the only time when a strike is

effective—when it jeopardises markets and thus hurts the capitalist.

No capitalist government has ever considered it one of its duties to find work for the unemployed, and it is only when the number of the unemployed becomes a danger that anything is done for them. An unemployed army is necessary to the capitalists in order to keep down wages and be available in times of brisk trade. If the State absorbs these unemployed in the ordinary channels of production they interfere with the opportunities of the capitalist. If the Government takes over mines, railways, and economises in the working, that again means increased unemployment. Expenditure on roads, bridges, and public buildings comes out of taxes paid by the capitalists, hence their opposition to all forms of extravagance. These facts explain the failure of the Government to set the unemployed to work, and show the futility of all the appeals and demands of the labour leaders, either for nationalisation, the right to work, or the continuation of the unemployment dole.

But Mr. Clynes says that "the failure of the State to do this work is not explained by alleging 'that masters are not concerned with increasing the total quantity of wealth.'" This sentence, torn from its context, becomes intelligible when read in the full paragraph as quoted at the head of this article: but standing alone, it is beyond Mr. Clynes' power to refute it. Only profits will draw capital, yet capital is so abundant that new concerns, or extensions of old ones, have had their shares taken up as soon as advertised, in many cases applications for shares being double the amount offered. Rings of capitalists are buying up cotton mills and other concerns at prices regarded as far above their actual value, while Government flotations have become unpopular because of the ever-increasing opportunities for profitable investment elsewhere. But these are not all the facts which go to prove that capitalists are concerned only with profits, and not at all with increasing the total quantity of wealth. Perhaps Mr. Clynes can find excuses for the capitalists who "waste thousands of gallons of milk daily" ("Daily News," 4.19.1919) or for those other capitalists who neglect to put their capital into housing schemes when there are thousands of building workers unemployed and a real shortage of jerry-built houses. On this point I may quote the "Daily Chronicle," Nov. 26:

At a meeting of the Property Owners' Protection Association at Winchester House yesterday Mr. A. G. Sheering, dealing with the enormous cost of repairs, said the builders' merchants seemed determined to do what they liked.

They had formed a schedule of prices, binding themselves under a penalty of £1,000 to charge these prices. Everything seemed pointing to success when the manufacturers stepped in and said, "Where do we come in? Unless you admit us to this ring you will get no materials."

The result was that the builders' merchants combined with the manufacturers to introduce a price list—(a voice: "It is a conspiracy")—which meant 800 to 1,200 per cent. over pre-war prices. Owners and builders were held up by this ring.

Or, as one who was lately a government official, perhaps he will attempt to explain away the Government Committee's Report on Trusts, where it is shown that in certain industries controlled by rings or trusts, employers are fined £1 for every ton they produce above the allotted quantity, and receive a "dole" of 10s. for each ton that their output falls below the allotted amount. There are firms in these combines that have not produced a single ton since the ring was formed, and yet draw 10s. per ton on the quantity originally allotted to them from the pool.

These are the real controllers of "output," and if the whole working class were starving these capitalists would be quite prepared to restrict the food supply still further if they saw a chance to increase their profits by such action. During the war, when food was short and every ton of shipping was urgently needed to bring necessities here, a wealthy capitalist—Solly Joel—could take a whole ship from this important work to bring home his race-horses from South Africa. During the same period fish was being sent to dust destructors to prevent the increased supply from bringing down prices. The fishermen had increased "output," but neither they nor the other workers gained the least benefit thereby.

Mr. Clynes quotes as follows from our article: "With modern machinery and methods every nation can produce more wealth than it can dispose of within its own boundaries, and it must find markets for the surplus elsewhere." On this he comments: "Now I do not claim to know what every other nation can do, but I do know that even with modern machinery it is impossible for this nation to produce for itself the quantity of cotton, iron-ore, timber, rubber, wool, and many other articles which we require for manufacturing purposes." What Mr. Clynes does know is what everybody has known for ages: we do not produce these things, and many others besides, but we produce their equivalents in other forms of wealth. What he does not claim to know Sir Auckland Geddes does know, and his statement, reported in the "Daily Chronicle," 19.10.19, confirms ours. He says:



To-day we are employing in industry some 300,000 more men and women than we were employing in trade before the war; but, so far as he could judge, it would be necessary for us to employ 1,000,000 persons more in industry than we did before the war.

In order to increase production it was necessary to look for new markets in the future to absorb the produce of more people in industry.

The area for new markets was not to be found in Europe. In other parts of the world the picture was different. There the markets were hungering for goods and were able to pay for them.

"Our social system is a bad one," says Mr. Clynes. That is what we say, and point out exactly why it is bad, and how to establish a sane system of society. We denounce labour leaders because they advocate reforms to prolong the system, and because, like Mr. Clynes, they tell the workers to "make the most of what they have got," and that "we ought not to make the system worse by aggravating the evils which are incidental to it"—an impossibility, because the workers, while capitalism lasts, have not the power either to aggravate or ally those evils, which grow worse with the growth of the system. Above all we oppose these "leaders" because they urge the workers to place political power in the hands of the masters.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, alone in this country adopts the correct attitude in this respect. We expose the evils and point the only way to remove them. F. F.

"Those who believe that the present system of society is essentially an evil, who condemn private enterprise root and branch, their business is to join those who are seeking to destroy it."—Lloyd George at Manchester, 6.12.19.

Well, we have told you often enough what your duty is—will you believe us now?

#### S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR DECEMBER.

##### LONDON DISTRICT.

##### Sundays:

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.  
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.  
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.  
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.  
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.  
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

##### Mondays:

Tollington Rd., Holloway Rd. (near Nag's Head), 8.

##### Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

##### Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

##### Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

##### Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

### A RETROSPECT.

#### LESSONS DRAWN FROM THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT FROM 1848 TO 1895.

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

CONCLUDED.

Moreover, with this successful use of the ballot, a wholly new method of proletarian warfare had gone into effect, which was rapidly extended. It was found that the political institutions, by means of which the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is organised, afford further handholds by which the working class can attack these very institutions. The party took part in the elections for State Legislatures, Aldermen and industrial courts, and contested against the bourgeoisie for every office in the filling of which a sufficient number of the proletariat had anything to say. And thus it happened that the bourgeoisie and the government came to a pass where they feared the lawful activity of the Labour Party far more than its unlawful activity; they dreaded the result of an election more than those of a rebellion. For here, too, the conditions of the struggle had materially changed. The old style rebellion, the street fight with barricades, which down to 1848 gave the final decision everywhere, had become decidedly antiquated.

Let us harbour no illusions on this point; a victory as between two armies, is a thing of the rarest occurrence. Moreover, the insurgents had seldom aimed at this. Their only object was to soften the troops by moral influences, such as in a conflict between two warring countries would be of no effect at all, or at any rate, in a far smaller degree. If this plan succeeds the soldiers refuse to obey orders or the officers lose their presence of mind and the revolt is successful. If this plan does not succeed, nevertheless, even in case the military is fewer in numbers, the result shows the superiority of their better equipment and training, of the unified leadership, of the well-planned arrangement of forces and their discipline. The most that an insurrection can attain in real tactical action is the scientific construction and defence of a single barricade. Mutual support, the disposition and utilisation of reserves, in short the assistance and co-operation of the separate divisions, which is indispensable for the defence even of a single district, to say nothing of the whole of a large city, is very imperfect, and for the most part wholly unattainable; concentration of forces upon a vital point is out of the question. A passive defense is the characteristic form of the struggle. The attack will extend here and

there to occasional sallies or flank movements, but only as exceptions, for as a rule it will be confined to occupying the positions abandoned by the retiring troops. Then, further, the military is supplied with artillery and with completely equipped and trained battalions of pioneers, which the insurgents in almost all cases wholly lack. No wonder, therefore, that even those barricade fights which were conducted with the most heroic bravery, as at Paris in June, 1848, at Vienna in October, 1848, and at Dresden in May, 1849, ended with the suppression of the revolt as soon as the officers of the army, unhampered by political considerations, fought according to purely military principles and the soldiers remained trustworthy.

The numerous successes of insurgents down to 1848 are due to manifold causes. At Paris in July, 1830, and in February, 1848, as also in most of the Spanish street fights, there stood between the insurgents and the military a citizens' guard, which either sided directly with the revolt or by its lukewarm and hesitating attitude caused the regular troops also to waver, and in addition to that, furnished the insurgents with arms. Wherever this civil guard at the start took a stand against the revolt, as in June 1848, at Paris, the insurgents were defeated. At Berlin, in 1848, the people won partly through an important addition of fresh forces during the night and on the morning of the 19th of March, partly on account of the fatigue and lack of care suffered by the troops, and partly on account of the hesitation of the authorities. But in all cases where a victory is won it was because the troops mutinied, or because the officers were lacking in determination, or because their hands were tied.

Therefore, even in the classical period of street fighting, the barricade was more of a moral than a material force. It was a means for breaking the loyalty of the army. If it accomplished this, the victory was won; if not the cause was lost.

Even in 1849 the chances were already poor enough. The bourgeoisie had gone over to the side of the governments; "culture and property" greeted and treated the troops marching out against the insurgents. The barricade had lost its charm. The soldiers no longer saw behind it the people, but only rebels, rioters, plunderers, "dividers-up," the outcasts of society; the officers had in time become skilled in the tactical forms of street fighting. They no longer marched out straight ahead and unprotected against the improvised breastworks, but went around them through gardens, courts and houses. And this course, with a little skill, would be successful in nine cases out of ten.

And since then many things have changed, and all to the advantage of the military. Though the large cities have become larger, so also have the armies. Paris and Berlin have not quadrupled since 1848, but their garrisons have been increased more than that. By means of the railroads these garrisons can be doubled in twenty-four hours, and in forty eight hours can be expanded into gigantic armies. The weapons of these enormous hosts are incomparably more effective than formerly. In 1848 they had only the smooth bore, percussion-cap, muzzle-loader; to-day the small calibre magazine breech-loader, which shoots four times as far, ten times as accurate, and ten times as fast as the other. At that time they had only the comparatively ineffective solid balls and cartridges of the artillery; to-day the percussion shells, a single one of which is sufficient to demolish the strongest barricade. At that time the pick of the pioneer for breaking through walls; to-day the dynamite bomb.

On the other hand, for the insurgents all the conditions have become worse. A revolt with which all layers of the population sympathise can hardly come again. In the class struggle all the middle layers of society will probably never rally around the proletariat so exclusively that the reactionary party which rallies to the bourgeoisie will almost disappear. The "people" therefor will always appear to be divided, and thereby a powerful lever is wanting which was so exceedingly effective in 1848. Even if more trained soldiers are found on the side of the insurgents, it will be so much the more difficult to arm them. The hunters' and sportsmen's guns from the retail stores, even if the police should not have rendered them unserviceable by removing part of the lock as a precautionary measure, cannot by any means compete with the magazine gun of the soldiers even at close range. Up to 1848 a man could manufacture the necessary ammunition himself out of powder and lead; but to-day the cartridge is different for every gun, and in only one particular is it alike everywhere, viz., in that it is a technical product of large scale industry, and therefore cannot be extempore, and therefore the most of guns are useless so long as one has not the ammunition specially fitted for them. Finally the new districts of the great cities have been laid out with long, straight, broad streets, as if made with special reference to operations with modern cannons small arms. The revolutionist would be insane who would deliberately select the new workingmen's districts in the north and east of Berlin for a barricade fight.

Does the reader now understand why the ruling classes are so anxious by all means to get



us where the rifle cracks and the sabre slashes? And why they to-day accuse us of cowardice because we do not straightway betake ourselves to the street, where we are beforehand certain of a defeat? And why they so passionately beseech us to play cannon fodder just for once?

These gentlemen are wasting both their prayers and their dares for nothing and less than nothing. We are not so green as all that. They might just as well ask their enemy in the next war to follow the line of formation used by Frederick the Great, or the formation in columns of entire divisions à la Wagram and Waterloo, and that, too, with the old flintlock gun in the hand. As conditions have changed for warfare, so not less for the class struggle. The period for sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where the question involves the complete transformation of the social organisation, there the masses themselves must be consulted, must themselves have already grasped what the struggle is about and what they stand for. This is what the history of the last fifty years has taught us. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and persistent work is needed, and it is just this work that we are now doing, and that, too, with a success which drives our opponents to despair.

In the Latin countries also people see more and more that the old tactics have to be revised. They have everywhere followed the German example of using the ballot and of winning every position which is accessible to them. In France where the ground has been broken up for 100 years by revolution upon revolution, where there is not a single party which has not furnished its share of conspiracies, insurrections and all other revolutionary doings; in France where, as the result of this condition, the Government is by no means certain of the army, and where the circumstances generally are far more favourable for an insurrectional venture than in Germany,—even in France the Socialists are coming to understand better and better that no enduring victory is possible for them unless they first win the great mass of the people;—that means there the peasants.

Slow propaganda work and parliamentary activity are recognised there, too, as the next task of the party. The results are not lacking. Not only has a whole string of municipal councils have been captured; even in the Chamber of Deputies there are fifty Socialists, and these have already overthrown three Cabinets and one President of the Republic. In Belgium last year the workingmen forced the granting of the electoral franchise and won in a fourth of the voting districts. In Switzerland, in Italy, in

Denmark, yes, even in Bulgaria and Roumania, the Socialists are represented in Parliament. In Austria all parties are agreed that our entry into the imperial council can no longer be prevented. We are bound to get in, that is certain; the only question now is, by what door? And even in Russia, whenever the celebrated Zemskij Sobor shall be assembled, that national convention which young Nicholas is trying in vain to prevent, we can count on it with certainty that we shall be represented there too.

It goes without saying that our foreign comrades do not relinquish their right of revolution. The right of revolution is after all the only actually "historical right," the only right upon which all modern States without exception rest, including even Mecklenburg, whose revolution of the nobility was ended in 1755 by the inheritance agreement,—that glorious charter of feudalism which is still in force to-day. The right of revolution is so irrefutably recognised in the public consciousness that General von Boguslawski out of this popular right alone derives the right of forcible usurpation which he justifies on behalf of the Emperor.

But whatever may happen in other countries, the German social democracy occupies a particular position, and hence has at least for the present a particular task. The two million voters which it sends to the ballot box, together with the young men and women who, as non-voters, stand behind them, constitute the largest and compactest mass, the decisive corps of the international proletarian army. This mass furnishes already over a quarter of the votes cast; and it grows unceasingly, as shown by the elections for the Reichstag, for the separate state legislatures; for the municipal councils, and for the industrial courts. Its growth goes on as spontaneously, steadily, and uninterruptedly, and at the same time as quietly as a process of nature. All the efforts of the government against it have shown themselves to be futile. We can to-day count on two and a quarter million voters. If that keeps up, we shall by the end of the century win the greater part of the middle strata of society, both small tradesmen and peasants, and shall become the determining power in the land before which all other powers must bow down, whether they want to or not. To keep this growth going uninterruptedly until of itself it overtops the prevailing system of government is our chief task. And there is only one means by which this steady increase of the militant Socialist forces in Germany could be momentarily checked and even set back for a time, viz, a conflict with the army on a large scale, a blood-letting like that of 1871 at Paris. In the long run even this would be overcome. Take a party which runs up into

millions and all the magazine guns in Europe and America together would not be sufficient to shoot it out of existence. But the normal development would be checked, and the end of the conflict would be delayed, prolonged, and accompanied with heavier sacrifices.

The irony of history turns everything upside down. We, the "revolutionists," the "revolvers," prosper far better by lawful measures than by unlawful measures and violence. The law and order parties, as they call themselves, go to ruin under the legal conditions which they themselves have established. They cry out in despair with Odilon Barrot; *la legalité nous tue*, "lawfulness is killing us"; while we, under this lawfulness, are getting firm muscles and rosy cheeks and are the picture of eternal life. And if we do not so completely lose our wits as to let ourselves be drawn into a street fight just to please them, then there remains nothing else for them to do finally except to break down this lawfulness themselves, which has proved so disadvantageous to them.

For the present they are making new laws against revolts. Again everything is turning upside down. These anti-revolt fanatics of to-day, are they they not themselves the revolvers of yesterday? For example, did we conjure up this civil war of 1866? Did we drive the King of Hanover, the electoral Prince of Hessen, the Duke of Nassau from their legitimate and hereditary lands, and then annex these countries? And now these smashers of the German confederation and of three grace-of-God crowns complain about revolt! *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?* Who could permit Bismarck's worshippers to complain about revolting?

Meanwhile let them pass their anti-revolt laws, and make them still more stringent; let them turn the whole criminal code into caoutchouc; they will accomplish nothing except to furnish new proof of their impotence. In order to get at the social democracy effectively they will have to take entirely different measures. The social democratic revolt, which just now finds its greatest advantage in observing the laws, can only be checked by a counter revolt of the law and order party which cannot exist without breaking the laws. Herr Roessler, the Prussian bureaucrat, and Herr von Boguslawski, the Prussian general, have pointed out to them the only way by which perhaps they can get even with the workingmen who will not let themselves be enticed into a street fight, breach of the constitution, dictatorship, a return to absolutism, *regis voluntas suprema lex!* Courage, therefore, gentlemen, no lip-puckering will answer here; you have got to whistle!

But do not forget that the German empire, as

well as all the small states composing it, and in general all modern states, are the product of a treaty; a treaty first of the princes among themselves, second of the princes with the people. If one side breaks the treaty, the whole treaty falls, and the other side is then no longer bound either.

It is now 1,600 years ago, almost to a year, that likewise a dangerous revolutionary party was carrying on its work in the Roman Empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state. It denied absolutely that the will of the people was the supreme law; it was fatherlandless, international; it spread out over all parts of the Empire, from Gaul to Asia, and even beyond the limits of the empire. It had for a long time worked under-ground and in secret, but for some time past it considered itself strong enough to come out into the light. This revolutionary party, which was known by the name of Christians, also had a large representation in the army. Whole legions were Christian. When they were ordered to attend the sacrifice ceremonies of the established heathen religion to perform the honours of the occasion, the revolutionary soldiers carried their impudence so far that by way of protest they struck into their helmets peculiar emblems—crosses. Even the customary floggings by the officers, with the cat-o'-nine tails of the barracks, were fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian was no longer able to look on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being subverted. He took hold energetically while there was yet time. He issued an anti-Socialist—or rather an anti-Christian—law. Assemblies of the revolvers were forbidden, their meeting halls closed or even torn down, the Christian emblems, crosses, etc., were forbidden the same as red handkerchiefs in Saxony. Christians were declared incapable of holding state offices, and could not even become lance corporals in the army. As they did not yet have at that time judges so carefully trained to observe a "respect for the person" as contemplated by Herr von Koellers' anti-revolt bill, the Christians were forbidden outright to resort to the courts at all. This exception law also proved ineffective. The Christians tore it down from the walls with contempt, aye, it is said that while the Emperor was in Nicomedia they set fire to the palace over his head. He revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians which took place in the year 303 of our era. It was the last of its kind: and it was so effective that seventeen years later the majority of the army consisted of Christians and the next succeeding monarch of the whole Roman Empire, Constantine, called by the priests the Great, proclaimed Christianity as the state religion.







Soldiers' Delegates called upon the army to send its political representatives, thereupon the peasant masses automatically sent in to the Soviets the same liberal intellectuals, who translated the indefiniteness of their hopes and aspirations into the language of the most contemptible quibbling and hair-splitting opportunism. The *petit bourgeois intelligentsia*, which was in every way dependent upon the greater bourgeoisie, obtained the leadership over the peasantry. The Soviets of soldier peasant representatives obtained a distinct majority over the representatives of the workers. The Petrograd advance guard was declared to be an ignorant mass. The flower of the Revolution was revealed in the persons of the March Social Revolutionists and Mensheviks of the 'provincial' intellectuals, leaning on the peasants." "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia," p. 264.

In defending the Brest-Litvsk peace Lenin said:

"Finally the task of Socialist reorganisation in Russia is so great, so difficult, both because of the *petit bourgeois* elements who are taking part in the Revolution, and because of the unsatisfactory level of the proletariat, that its solution still requires some time." ("Why Soviet Russia Made Peace.")

In May, 1917 Lenin wrote of the prospects in "Letters from Abroad, Number One:

"Historic conditions have made the Russian workers, perhaps for a short period, the leaders of the international proletariat, but Socialism cannot now prevail in Russia. We can only expect an agrarian revolution, which will help to create more favourable conditions for working-class development. The main result of the present Revolution will have to be the creation of forces for more revolutionary activity, and to influence the more highly developed European countries into action."—"Proletarian Revolution in Russia," p. 30.

The large proportion of small property holders to workers in Russia was pointed out by Lenin and Zinoviev in 1915:

"The ruling class of Russia comprises only 43 per cent. of its population, namely, less than one half."—"Socialism and War."

Karl Radek, the Bolshevik leader ("Class Struggle," Aug. 1919) justifies the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks in Russia on the ground that Russia "possesses a proletarian minority." He says that in countries with a capitalist minority a dictatorship would be unnecessary owing to weak resistance.

### The Bolsheviks and Democracy.

Prior to seizing power the Bolshevik leaders demanded a Constituent Assembly.

Writing in the "Novy Mir" (New York) of March 19th last, Trotsky said:

"Only a revolutionary labour government will have the desire and ability to give the country a thorough democratic cleansing during the work preparatory to the Constituent Assembly, to reconstruct the army from top to bottom, to turn it into a *revolutionary militia*, and to show the poorer peasants a practice that their only salvation is in support of a revolutionary Labour regime. A Constituent Assembly convoked after such preparatory work will truly reflect the revolutionary creative forces of the country and become a powerful factor in the further development of the Revolution."—"Our Revolution," p. 204.

During Kerensky's Provisional Government the Bolsheviks frequently denounced them for delaying the election of the Constituent Assembly. As soon, however, as it was elected the Bolshevik minority withdrew and Lenin's Government dispersed it on the ground that it was elected on old lists and was not representative. They claimed that events moved so rapidly that the population had become Bolshevik since the nominations and voting took place. Trotsky says ("October to Brest-Litvsk," p. 80), "democratic institutions become a still less perfect medium for the expression of the class struggle under revolutionary circumstances." Ever since the abolition of the Constituent Assembly Lenin and Trotsky have attacked the idea of democracy. Lenin has gone so far as to say: "Democracy is only a form of authority. We Marxists are opposed to every form of authority."—"Proletarian Revolution in Russia," p. 104. "The word democracy cannot be scientifically applied to the Communist Party. Since March 1917 the word democracy is simply a shackle fastened upon the revolutionary nation and preventing it from establishing boldly, freely, and regardless of all obstacles a new form of power: the Council of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates, harbinger of the abolition of every form of authority." (P. 155.)

This anarchistic objection to authority recalls Engels' reply to the Italian followers of Bakunin, published in the "Neue Zeit" in 1873, on "The Principle of Authority," in which he said: "Either the Anti-authoritarians do not themselves know what they are talking about, and in that case they are only creating confusion, or they do know, and in that case they are betraying the cause of the proletariat. In either case they are only serving the reaction."

Lenin compares the Soviet form of government to the Paris Commune. The Paris Commune, however, was elected by universal suffrage, and had it not used its authority it would not have lasted more than a day, as Engels' clearly shows.

In his book "From October to Brest-Litvsk" Trotsky had agreed to the democratic principle which they afterwards condemned. "If," he wrote, "in the final analysis, it is to the advantage of the proletariat to introduce its class struggle, and even its dictatorship, through the channels of democratic institutions, it does not follow that history always affords it the opportunity for attaining this happy consummation."

Writing in July 1917 ("Constitutional Illusions") Lenin denounced the Provisional Government as being afraid to call the Constituent Assembly—which was doubtless true. Lenin said:

"The Constituent Assembly in Russia at present would give a large majority to the peasants, who are more left than the Social Revolutionists. The bourgeoisie knows this. Knowing this, it cannot help but struggle against an early convocation of the Constituent Assembly."

When Lenin's prophesy was fulfilled and the peasants' delegates were the majority, the Bolsheviks abolished the Assembly "by the bayonets of the Red Guard," to use Lenin's words.

Originally the Bolsheviks demanded complete power for the Soviet executive "until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly." After the Bolsheviks had assumed power for three months, they announced the elections for the Assembly (Nov. 25, 1917), and dispersed it when it showed the Bolsheviks in a minority. The so-called reasons for abolishing the Assembly still lack evidence in their support for the Bolsheviks permitted the elections to be held.

### Dictatorship and the Soviets.

The Bolsheviks have often defended their dictatorship by quoting Marx's criticism of the Gotha Program (1875) where he refers to the transition from Capitalism to Socialism as the Dictatorship of the Proletariat pending the abolition of classes altogether. Marx, however, refers to a dictatorship asserted by a working-class majority over the capitalist few, and not to the dictatorship of a minority attacked by Engels in his Criticism of the Blanquist Program.

Lenin has admitted the Blanquist character of the November 1917 seizure of power—

"Just as 150,000 lordly landowners under Czarism dominated the 130,000,000 Russian peasants, so 200,000 members of the Bolshevik

party are imposing their proletarian will on the mass, but this time in the interest of the latter."—"The New International," New York, April, 1918, Bolshevik paper.

Lenin's defence of this as due to the lack of knowledge among the masses is in these words:

"If Socialism can only be realised when the intellectual development of all the people permits it, then we shall not see Socialism for at least 500 years. The Socialist political party, this is the vanguard of the working class, must not allow itself to be halted by the lack of education of the mass average, but must lead the masses, using the Soviets as organs of revolutionary initiative."—Lenin at Peasants' Congress. "Ten days that Shook the World." P. 303.

Here we get a possible reason for the objection to democracy. The argument that the Bolshevik action is justified because it brings desired results is not true, because Russia is feeling the effects of the backward majority and lack of mental training. Lenin admits this in his "Soviets at Work." No democratic society can advance beyond the general mental level of its members, and the internal conflict of various sections of the workers bears adequate witness of this. Socialist society more than any other would require the active, enthusiastic, and intelligent support and interest of the majority to co-operate in conducting affairs. While political democracy is but a part, and incomplete without industrial democracy, we have to use even the semi-democratic forms of modern capitalism in order to organise the workers for the capture of political power. Democracy is not a bourgeois idea—it flourished in the ancient gens—and even complete political democracy is feared by the capitalists because of the growing interest of the workers in Socialism.

Soviet government is not the highest form of democracy, for the Executive is several times removed from the actual voters. The fear of peasant dominance is seen in the Constitution, which gives 125,000 city voters five times the representation of the rurals. E. S.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS  
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.



## OUTLOOK FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.

Since last writing these notes three conventions have been held in Chicago (Sept. 1-7), and the dyed-in-the-wool social reformers and opportunists have remained in the Socialist Party of America. The great bulk of the delegates, however, formed the Communist Party. This is composed to the extent of about 75 per cent. of foreign-speaking federations, Russians predominating. They adopted a program and manifesto slavishly imitating that of the Moscow Bolshevik Conference in 1919. It is based on the idea that capitalism has collapsed and that now we are in a revolutionary crisis. Mass Action is therefore advocated, and it means the spontaneous instinctive rising of workers, organised or not. It is insurrection doomed to failure. The platform also stands for Industrial Unionism without specifying any organisation supporting it. Educating the workers in Socialism is ignored, and we are told "now is the time for action." The program and manifesto are written in a language all their own, and as far as the average worker is concerned it might as well be written in ancient Greek.

The "left wing" element split, part going with the Russians and forming the Communist Party, another part joining together under the name of the Communist Labor Party, whose strength is mostly drawn from the West. This party contains confusion enough for a dozen parties—reformers and Bolsheviks side by side with avowed I.W.W.s and Nationalists. The leading spirits are Jim Larkin, the supporter of a Labour Party for America, Jack Carney, late of the London Daily Herald League, John Reed, the Bolshevik envoy who never acted, Max Eastman, pacifist and dilettante utopian. Later these two parties may unite, as both of them are but echoes of the Bolshevik movement, however little they understand its significance. The Communist Labor Party endorses the I.W.W. and is Syndicalist in tendency.

The combined activity of these two parties is having little more effect than causing police raids and arrests, and making it harder to hold meetings and conduct educational work.

Apart from these groups there is growing, slowly but surely, a number of groups throughout the country holding to the Marxian position. Study of the classics of Socialism combined with reading the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* and the work of those who have been connected with the Socialist Party of Great Britain, are large factors in the Marxian movement here. The "Proletarian," a monthly of Detroit, promoted by the Proletarian University, has been doing

good work, but some of the elements associated with it are not yet fully conscious of the correct policy for the workers. The delegates of the Michigan State worked together with Russian Federations to organise the Communist Party, but found themselves in a hopeless minority. Michigan's platform and policy drawn up specially for presentation as the basis of the new party was superior to that of the Russians, which was adopted. The Michigan platform, however, was a mixture of excerpts from Bolshevik manifestoes, Industrial Unionism, etc., which fitted in strangely with the Marxian ideas also inserted. These confusing ideas were a concession to the Russians and the Mass Action element of Louis Fraina and his satellites. If the Michigan delegates had kept to the former and fairly clear position long since conciated with the "Proletarian" the chances for a new party here would be brighter.

The Socialist Party of the United States was formed in 1916 in Detroit from a group of comrades who seceded from the Socialist Party of America together with some members of the Socialist Party of Canada and the Socialist Party of North America. They afterwards took the name of the Worker's Socialist Party of U.S. They promoted lectures and study classes, and conducted much educational work, but lack of preparation outside the motor city hampered their activities, and the entry of America into the war drove the most active workers to distant parts of this and other lands doing "war" work.

When the Michigan State of the S.P. of A. showed signs of becoming Socialist and was expelled, many of the remaining members joined the expelled S.P. and looked forward to seeing a real party at last! Proletarian or Marxian clubs have been formed in New York City, Cleveland, Portland (Oregon), and San Francisco, and intensive educational work is going on which may result soon in the secession of the Marxian minority element from the Communists and their linking up with others in the building of a Socialist Party on sound lines. At present persistent criticism and education of the best elements is the road ahead.

Great strikes are the order of the day here as elsewhere. Judge Gary, the head of the Steel Trust, has driven the steel workers to strike and refuses to allow them to organise or arbitrate. These are the men who worked night and day to make the steel to win the war. The strike is gradually dying under the influence of armed force and hunger. This is a A.F. of L. strike as the steel workers have only just been organised and the organiser of the strike is a Syndicalist, William L. Foster.

The Workers' International Industrial Union

is progressing—backwards. It adopted a resolution demanding Irish self-government, which is full of national sentiment, and another resolution advocating steps being taken to secure unity between the W.I.I.U. and the I.W.W. Such is the clarity of our De Leonites!

William D. Haywood has been released on bail from prison pending an appeal to the Supreme Court. He at once gave the Associated Press the following statement (July 28, 1919):

This is strictly in line with their tactics at the trial, when they tried to show their loyalty by producing soldier members as witnesses.

The Non-Partisan League in the North West is growing amongst the farmers and so-called Radicals. Many prominent S.P. men have joined it to get the pickings in the way of fat jobs. Arthur Le Seur and Walter Thos. Mills are two ex members of the S.P. Executive who have secured plums and are touring for the league in the two Dakotas, Montana, etc. This body promotes reform agitation of an agrarian kind, especially amongst the farmers and their slaves. It has a program of capitalist reforms, and owing to pacifist and Syndicalist tendencies it has many supporters among the I.W.W. and so-called Socialists. It has many members elected to State legislatures.

The present position of the S.L.P. of A. reminds one of Huxley's picture of the prospects of the Catholic Church, once so fair, now facing disaster. The lowest ebb that has ever been reached in its career was recorded recently when practically all its prominent members sailed out into other fields. Edmund Seidel, the Editor of the "Weekly People," was expelled and is now the candidate for New York for the rotten S.P. of A. Rudolph Katz, author of "With De Leon since '91," and an official of the I.W.W., was expelled after nearly 30 years in the S.L.P. Like Seidel he began to flirt with the S.P. as he thoughtlessly imitated the unity craze of the S.L.P. The Presidential Candidate of the S.L.P. at the last election (1916), Arthur E. Reimer, resigned as he thought the war might have a democratic tinge and he no longer believed Industrial Unionism was essential. The Vice-Presidential candidate, Caleb Harrison, was expelled, and the Chicago Local were expelled because they would not expel Harrison—Harrison was a delegate to the spurious Communist Labour Party. The Philadelphia Local was dissolved, also New York City, and had to be re-organised as Industrial Unionism mixed up with Socialism causes gymnastics and ideas fruitful of confusion.

Not satisfied with repeating De Leon's nonsense about religion being a private matter against Marx's idea that it was the "opium of

the people," the S.L.P. and the W.I.I.U. are discovering fresh "facts." Verily, as Marx says in the "Eighteenth Brumaire," man makes history, at least, the S.L.P. man does, and makes his facts as he goes along. The "First of May Magazine," issued by the W.I.I.U., tells us in an article on Marxism and De Leonism:

Great as the achievement of the system of Marx is, it nevertheless contains a serious flaw or defect, which if left unnoticed would have caused considerable disorder and chaos in the ranks of the working class. In fact, it already in the past was a great source of mischief and confusion, and would have inevitably led the movement into disaster, if not in time noticed and rectified by the great American thinker, Daniel de Leon. De Leon has supplemented, or rather complemented Marxism; he has, so to speak, re-enforced this wonderful theoretic structure.

And later we are told:

It is the HOW of the revolution, the HOW of the transformation, the HOW of the collapse of Capitalism that Marx fails to supply an adequate answer to and the solution of which we are indebted to De Leon.

Such is the dementia produced by Industrial Unionism. Previously they used to argue that Marx supported Industrial Unionism, and they invented imaginary conversations Marx "had" with imaginary people in the land of Nod, to prove their point. But they now find Marx was wrong—only a De Leon could discover the "value" of organising a revolutionary union without revolutionists to take and hold that which the armed forces will keep from them.

Truly the S.L.P. and W.I.I.U. are for weakly people. E. S.

## THAT WHICH MATTERS.

There is only one road that leads to Socialism: the workers have to learn, first, that they are slaves, second, how they are enslaved, third, the revolutionary changes necessary to achieve their freedom, and fourth, how to accomplish this revolution. A majority of the workers must understand these things, therefore the need of the day is for Socialists to spread the knowledge. If all the people who call themselves Socialists were so in reality the task of establishing Socialism would be well on the way. But unfortunately, there are many well-meaning people who, not understanding Socialism, do much to hinder the movement by stupid and ignorant misrepresentation. Usually, however, these are the dupes and victims of conscious frauds who are in the labour movement because it pays, and who call themselves Socialists for the same reason.

The Socialist is not much concerned with their reasons or their personal ambitions; before these frauds and their dupes can mislead the workers they must give utterance to some



beliefs, ideas, or policies likely to influence them. The Socialist examines the proposals, and without troubling greatly to ascertain whether they emanate from the conscious fraud or the ignorant dupe, classifies them according to the degree of danger with which they threaten his movement. In his analysis of various manifestos he finds that the most dangerous are those bearing his label—Socialist—while fostering and proclaiming capitalist dogmas and and superstitions antagonistic to Socialism.

That parties built on such a contradiction should exist and flourish seems incredible, but it is only necessary to point to the attitude of the Labour Party in giving its support to the capitalist class during the war, and to their almost unanimous support of the demand for increased production. So far as the latter is concerned, the Labour Party has never given any evidence that they even understand it. The star turns of the I.L.P. have written columns of stuff on the question in the "Labour Leader," but in spite of unexampled opportunities for information, statistics, etc., the subject has never been handled from the Socialist point of view.

In the House of Commons the Premier has said "We must have greater production." The Labour Party have replied that they "will do their share," meaning that they will urge the workers to do it for them. No one would suspect that they were supposed to represent the workers if it were not for the plea they advance that "the slackening in production is not all the fault of the workers." Because they, the leaders, have neglected to master the elements of economics they are reduced to the position of defendants who can only plead that "it is not all their fault."

A knowledge of economics rightly used would give labour leaders the initiative, and the power to attack in the political arena; but, even if they possessed the knowledge, not being Socialists, elected by Socialists, they dare not use it. Labour leaders cannot move beyond the ideas of their supporters, who, educated along capitalist lines, think that it is in the administration of the system that their troubles lie. New administrators, sympathetic to them as workers, they think, will restore some of the balance to them. The leaders, recognising this ingrained dependence on capitalism, realise that they must help the workers as they want to be helped if they are to make their leadership pay. To attempt to put the workers right on their actual position as a slave class and to impress upon them the need for intelligent and organised action against the system, would only result in the alienation of capitalist support and their rejection at the polls.

That the capitalist parties to-day can look—

as they do—with equanimity on the possibility of a labour Government, proves that there is nothing dangerous to capitalism in the movement, and therefore little, if anything, beneficial to the working class.

The general notion of Socialism as "State ownership of the means of wealth production," because it is a general notion, does not exonerate the leaders. Invented and disseminated by capitalist politicians and agents, this definition has been accepted by labour leaders and advocated as a sovereign remedy for working-class ills. Even the so-called extremists of the labour movement boost nationalisation as a step towards Socialism because under it, they say, the workers will have a measure of control. This is altogether false, as a glance at the Post Office and other State concerns will show—the workers in those concerns being more dependent and having less freedom, if anything, than those under private enterprise. Not only so, the workers, instead of insisting on a measure of control, are more likely to be side-tracked, like all civil servants, into the belief that discipline and organisation is the necessary complement of State efficiency in the interests of the "general public."

To make of the workers State employees does not make them Socialists, and consequently does not help towards Socialism. On the contrary, it leads the workers up a blind alley, wasting their energies on something that does not materially change their conditions, and leaving them apathetic and ignorant as to the cause of their failure.

The first test of a Socialist party is does it make Socialists. Because the Labour Party advocates State ownership and either calls it Socialism or a step towards Socialism, they fail in the supreme test. Their failure to diagnose minor questions, therefore, becomes intelligible. When they engaged in recruiting during the war, taking up sides with one capitalist section, and persuading members of the working class to do likewise, they violated another great Socialist principle: that the working class of all lands, having no interests in common with any section of the master-class, but all alike suffering under the same form of wage slavery, must unite internationally for the overthrow of capitalism.

With the so-called peace, capitalist statesmen launched their reconstruction policy, mainly composed of increased production. Here again the Labour Party were caught and carried along in the flood of capitalist propaganda. Some of them, like Brownlie, outpacing their masters in their efforts to deceive the workers, while all of them, agreeing with the capitalist determination to extend their markets, and utterly failing to show how this could benefit the workers, took

up the parrot cry and repeated it—in some cases with mild reservations—because they feared the denunciation of the capitalist Press.

Whatever decreased production might mean for the workers—if it were possible,—it is certain that increased production, per individual, means falling prices for the workers' only commodity: labour-power. But no section of the Labour Party has ever viewed it in this light. Instead, they advise economies in working, which, so far as the workers are concerned, has the same result: increased unemployment and competition, and reduced wages. An instance of this, which illustrates the point and at the same time explodes State ownership, is supplied by Sir Leo Chiozza Money in the "Labour Leader," Nov. 6th. While endeavouring to point out "The true path to a maximum output of real wealth," through "national control," "workers brought into the management, and the prices of output determined by proper costings," he declares that "capitalism disorganises production and devours the nation's substance with its army of non-producers." The latter are not merely the capitalists; they include all those workers catering for their luxury, or engaged in trade without assisting in production or distribution. As an instance Sir Leo mentions the Lever combine. He says: "It has a capital of about £20,000,000, but I venture to think that a nationalised soap trade could make more soap, and cheaper soap, with much less capital."

Here we see another issue raised which has nothing to do with the question from the workers' view-point. The over-capitalisation, so-called, of any concern merely means that instead of a large dividend on a small number of shares there is a smaller dividend on a larger number of shares—unless by an extension of the business (which must be at the expense of other firms) the old rate of dividend is maintained. As the workers do not share in dividends, whether they go up or down, or whether they are divided among forty or four hundred capitalists, is a matter of indifference to them.

But Sir Leo thinks differently; he writes as though the workers did share in dividends. "Look at the monopolist," he says, "spreading his tentacles over the units of the trade. . . . He has to give an extravagant price for businesses. . . . That price ranks as capital of the combine and subscribers are promised a high rate of dividend."

The only way to increase dividends is by reducing wages, speeding up, or raising prices. As the capitalist cannot influence prices, which are determined by the cost of production in the main, though subject to fluctuations through the vagaries of the market, he turns his atten-

tion to wages and the quantitative production per worker. But here again he finds no new source of profit, because speeding up has long ago reached the high water mark, and wages are so low that any reduction would at once be followed by a reduced output, due entirely to the physical impossibility of maintaining the pace on a lower standard of living.

In the "New Statesman" (27.9.19) a prominent capitalist writer says that the production of commodities, and services, is greater than in 1913 and greater than ever before; and far from production having fallen, it has increased enormously in agriculture, shipping, wool, cotton, motor-cars, clothes, and in export trade generally. But Sir Leo, although recognised as one of the best statisticians on production, seems totally ignorant of these facts and, consequently, incapable of taking up the correct attitude in the interests of the workers. Instead of denying the calumnies of lying capitalist agents he feebly protests that: "Just before the war I published one or two works in which I endeavoured to point out to the nation at large that its material output, as revealed by the census of production, was miserably inadequate," and again he says: "I hope no word of this will be interpreted as deprecating the duty of producing as much as possible." Thus at the very outset he ranges himself alongside the agents of the master class by falsely admitting their charges.

Like all capitalist economists, Sir Leo has no conception of price apart from the fluctuations of the market due to supply and demand. In reply to the statement often made, that "if British workmen will only produce more, prices will come down," he claims that British prices are determined by world production, in other words, by competition. Instead of showing that the only result of increased production on the part of the worker is an earlier date for the sack, he dogmatizes on the capitalist price list, a purely capitalist concern, which does not affect the workers because wages, approximating to the cost of living, always rise or fall in accordance with the prices of necessities. Of course the adjustment of wages to the changing prices of necessities causes friction; but friction is just as inevitable under the capitalist system as fluctuations of prices. Why, then, does Sir Leo complicate the issue by dragging in the question of prices at all?

For the same reason that all the self-styled labour leaders fail to present the true working-class position in opposition to avowed capitalist defenders—because it would not pay—Sir Leo, like the rest of the labour gang, advocates reform of the capitalist system in various ways. His chief palliative is "national control," but,



"even then," he says, "our own wealth and our own prices would largely depend upon world causation," thus showing that his "national control" means capitalist control, and the retention of wage-slavery. To talk of "our own wealth and our own prices," therefore, is mockery so far as the workers are concerned. Like the rest of the labour gang, too, he demands a share in the management for the workers, but while the capitalists own—whether through the company, the combine, or the State—they will never allow the workers to interfere in this way unless their participation in management makes for greater individual production. The labour leaders all know that it is only along this line that workshop representation will be encouraged, and it will then only mean increased efficiency with its inevitable results, more unemployment and reduced wages.

Ownership of the means of wealth production alone gives control; that is why the Socialist Party declares that until the workers organise politically to gain possession of the means of wealth production all the schemes of labour leaders to give them a share of control are impossibilist dreams.

The capitalist class own the means of life, to-day, and consequently, all the wealth produced by the working class. What the workers can buy back with their wages just enables them to maintain themselves as a slave class. As they must have this minimum quantity of wealth, wages have to be adjusted to prices. It is in this adjustment process that the antagonism of interests between the two classes manifests itself. The workers have yet to learn that this antagonism is not only destructive of schemes of share in control, but is the germ of a conscious antagonism that can never be abolished until the means of life are the common property of society—not the common property of the capitalist class through State ownership, nationalisation, or national control—controlled by the people through a democratic administration of production and distribution for use instead of for profit.

It is to obscure these facts that the labour gang actively propagate their absurd nostrums. The enlightenment of the workers would lose them their jobs; they could then no longer strut across the stage of life puffed up with exaggerated notions of their own importance, because no one would look at them, except with scorn. The ignorance of the workers makes them leaders. The acquirement of the knowledge of Socialism by the workers will unmake them. Our message is to the worker, and exposes the labour fraud at the same time that it declares the real enemy of the worker to be the capitalist class.

F. F.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 &amp; Printed by A. SUCKLING 156 High St

## THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

### OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

## Declaration of Principles

### THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

#### HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.